

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

3

VOL. I

SPRING 1949

Editorial

South Africa's Trek from
Progress

David Kemp

Two Views:

Whitehead's God

Nathan Davidson

Science and Whitehead's World

Edwin Blair

The Tucker Car and the American
Auto Industry

Harry Marlowe

German Resistance Today:

Open Letter to General Clay

Otto Strasser

Which Road Must We Take?

Pastor Adalbert Knees

Letter

C. P. Mayhew

Humanity's Resources and the New
Malthusianism

Stephen D. Banner

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

SUMMER 1948

Germany and World Development
Aspects of American Militarism

Ernst Zander
Ray Jackson

1 VOL. 1

German Resistance—To-day:
Is That Christianity?
Is It Not Our Duty to Resist?

Pastor Adalbert Knees

Towards a Solution in Palestine
John Dewey and the Peculiar Traits
of American Thought—Part I

Paul Ecker
A. E. Bain

WINTER 1948

British Development and
The Common Illusion

Geoffrey Quilter

2 VOL. 1

German Resistance To-day:
An Open Letter

Pastor Adalbert Knees

Yugoslavia:
First Rumble of the Coming Storm

Paul Ecker

T. S. Eliot As Critic:
Outline for a critical approach

S. J. Wyndham

'If We Must Die...':
Negro anti-draft campaign

The Last Isolationist

Charles Graham

Pragmatism's Evolutionary Model:
John Dewey and the Peculiar Traits
of American Thought—Part II

A. E. Bain

CONTEMPORARY PRESS, 10 Blomfield Court, London, W.9
CONTEMPORARY PRESS, 545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York

SOME PRESS OPINIONS OF 'CONTEMPORARY ISSUES'

'...Nor is the reader helped on this stony path by any persuasive lucidity of style...'
The Times Literary Supplement, July 31st, 1948.

'Most important of all throughout it condemns that tortuous justification of political compromise and immorality which has corrupted Socialism into a well-nigh meaningless term.'

'Increasingly those whose Socialism springs from love of their fellow men and hence hatred of inequality and domination in any form are drawing together intellectually and organizationally. This magazine will be read by, and is a weapon of, such people.'
Common Wealth Review, January, 1949.

'A conception of democracy invigorating in its scope and vastly different from most current views...'

'I feel that no one who reads *Contemporary Issues* can remain indifferent to it. The polarization of public opinion will be in the direction of increased sympathetic involvement or of hostility. An interesting experiment is under way.'

Personalist News, March, 1949.

1

1

ork

y of

n of
well-

and
ether
upon
9,
from

to it.
hetic
9,

E

F

so

Ac

ca

an

in

on

th

so

po

un

his

Se

'Ir

fu

M

tri

sit

hu

wi

the

pro

sev

sus

fre

in

cir

Ge

J

the

Pa

gen

in

pol

Th

EDITORIAL

FROM any specific individual political event it is important to learn something about the general development of society. The case of Pastor Adalbert Knees has now become so flagrant, that CONTEMPORARY ISSUES can no longer limit itself to the publication of his speeches and pamphlets, and reports on the progress of his resistance to British Military Authority in Germany, but proceeds to broader comment. He and his friends are the only individuals, in addition to ourselves, who have dared to break through the prevailing conformism, theoretically and practically, and who have sought to establish an independent movement. From the practical-political point of view, the seriousness of the attempt which Pastor Knees has directly undertaken is demonstrated in the actions of Military Government and by his own conduct. He was arrested (which in any case he expected) on September 13th last year by the authorities, and later transferred to an 'Institute for Nervous Diseases' for observation (not a very original subterfuge). Declared eventually to be of sound mind he was again confined in Military prison, where, at the time of going to Press, he is still awaiting trial after these many months. His own high seriousness and sense of responsibility for his actions was admirably vindicated in prison by an eight weeks' hunger strike in protest against the Bochum dismantlings and in solidarity with the six arrested men, and was only interrupted by forced feeding and the persuasion of his friends. How weak must society feel itself which proceeds against the leader of a single democratic movement with such severity and by that most extreme form of slander which tries to create suspicions as to his 'mental condition'—but which at the same time shrinks from a political explanation. Apparently one may still be permitted to *argue* in this society under conditions of 'real' democracy, but must under no circumstances wish to *behave* really democratically—and certainly not the Germans accused by General Clay and others of 'docility'.

But it is well to remind ourselves that significant processes often manifest themselves in unpretentious beginnings, and the measures adopted against Pastor Knees prove that he has touched the problems of our time at a sensitive spot. If the ruling forces are permitted to smother the first attempt in embryo, it would have to recur sooner or later in another form since political necessities do not in the long run allow themselves to be suppressed. The painful historical process, with its numerous bypaths and regressions

can, however, be shortened, if one pioneers and protects from destruction existing vestiges and resources for resistance. Practically stated, the liberation of Pastor Knees, the rescue of a courageous man devoted to truth and the welfare of the community is the most urgent task. An attempt not only attacked by British occupation authorities in Germany but hindered by Government and press in Britain which claim to be the great protagonists for the democratic solution of world problems. The press generally was circulated with letters outlining the important facts of the Knees case, and in most instances accompanied by statements of and on the Pastor. With the exception of a few small publications, which we thank warmly and distinguish sharply from the official and accredited press, the response to all efforts was a lack of response. Either they referred the case elsewhere, or postponed publication pending further inquiry, which meant in fact nothing by way of results, or they simply refused to publish, or resorted to the more indecent expedient of not acknowledging the appeal. Members of Parliament, both of the 'right' and the 'left', adopted mainly similar methods of quashing publicity. Exceptions were rare, and again we very gratefully acknowledge them, but unfortunately they went no further than one question in the House and a statement by the Under-Secretary which we publish. Nor is it only the paucity of parliamentary protest which matters, but its limitation to and connivance at existing policies for Military occupation of Germany. This attitude of acquiescence also interfered with assistance from those many individual citizens to whom we wrote in the hope of discovering somewhere some democrats who are still morally upright not only at the expense of another community. Prominent Church individuals of all denominations were also approached. In America much the same course was followed with similar results. The encouraging exceptions were a students' meeting at Chicago university and a notice in the American-German press.

Although the results of the campaign here and abroad, necessarily limited by our small resources, were largely negative, important lessons are to be learnt. What could be more important than an accumulation of evidence that attests the degree to which democratic values have worsened? In supposedly advanced society, among those in positions of authority in the conduct of public affairs, and among individuals possessed of intellect and talents which should assist them to better their judgements, we have had no marked success in our search for intransigent protestants against Allied policy in Germany, properly described, to use a phrase of Gollancz's, as 'Hitlerism in reverse'. Our search has begun the lesson also that the customary political distinctions between 'left' and 'right' are, on the question of Germany at least, non-existent. If anything the response from the 'right' was better. It remains, however, still to be shown to what extent democratic awareness has experienced its stultification on other contemporary matters. As in

previous issues, so in this number of our magazine we analyse its restriction in science by those who recommend religious authoritarianism, in Ecology through the popularization of a new Malthusianism, its brutal suppression in the colonies, and the limitation of commodities beneficial to the public by the deliberate retardation of technological advance.

We are also able in this issue to present our readers with three points of view on German affairs for their deliberation. We look forward to our magazine becoming an open forum for public opinion on all issues, and renew our invitation to readers to send in articles, reports, documents, newspaper extracts, etc. We would be pleased also to send to anybody, on request, the relevant documents in connection with the Pastor's struggle.

.

To appear in early issues: Ernst Zander's 'Interim Balance Sheet'; 'America and The Great Utopia'; S. J. Wyndham's 'Victor Gollancz and Erich Fromm—Two Affirmations'; 'Nicholas Berdyaev'; Dr. Daniel T. MacDougal's 'Freedom in Research and Atomic Energy'; David Kemp's 'The Return to Slavery', 'The Irish Anti-Partition Movement'; Geoffrey Quilter's, 'The Coming Elections in Britain'; Ronald Irving, 'Picasso', etc.

David Kemp

SOUTH AFRICA'S TREK FROM PROGRESS¹

THE election of a Nationalist Government on a programme of complete segregation in June, 1948, was a significant occurrence in the recent development of the Union of South Africa, a country where every stratum of society must move in an ambience of contradiction so sharp that half-measures are impossible. The dependence of an exceptionally favoured minority upon the wretchedness of an economically and racially oppressed majority imparts a crippling quality to social relationships, impedes every field of endeavour and sets a premium upon irrationalism and brute force. But South Africa is not a neglected fragment of barbarism which has as yet failed to catch up with advanced development. The country has been moulded by the most efficient currents of Western growth which have impinged upon it to create and intensify the remarkable discrepancies and distortions which characterize its racial structure and are a source of ever-present tension. The Nationalist victory, far from placing the Union beyond the pale of civilization, was quite in harmony with an ominous tendency prevalent throughout the world today.

It is the striking phenomenon of our age of economic contraction and political repression that more and more whole nations are victimised and sacrificed in the vain effort to continue the functioning of a top-heavy system. In reaction to and aggravating the shrinkage of world trade, the tendency is to restrict the production and supply of commodities with the consequence of falling standards of living. The accompanying autarchic endeavours, however, do not solve the general economic problem but seriously and on increasing scale corrode the very productive base. The only relief becomes militarism, the most destructive aspect of the present tendency. The political concomitants are inevitable and are becoming all too familiar—nationalisation projects which place power more securely in the hands of a ruling layer divorced from the public, with increasing dictatorial tendencies, heavier taxation in manifold forms with decreasing representation, a growing approximation to the Russian type of social organisation.

For the colonial countries it becomes ever more clear that advances towards independence were merely temporary or apparent and that the old scourges are intensified and supplemented by the universal drive to backward conditions. The South African social structure is marked by the distortions of an earlier era from which it has never emerged although during the war period, the country seemed to be developing in a progressive direction.

In his statement to the 22nd ordinary general meeting of Barclay's

¹ Figures quoted are usually derived from official sources but the lack of adequate statistical information in the Union has been pointed out by Report No. 6 of the Social and Economic Planning Council (1944). Wherever there is no absolute certainty, e.g. conditions of poverty, etc., I have chosen the most conservative estimates.

Bank in London, the chairman, for example, reviewing the international position, expounded the following view of the role of peripheral territories: 'In the constantly shrinking world of today, when so many countries, obsessed with the problem sometimes euphemistically described as 'dollar shortage', are turning, or being forced to turn, more and more in the direction of self-sufficiency, it is refreshing to have in view a clear object for a constructive policy and one which aims at an expansion, rather than a contraction, in economic activity. Such is the cause of 'colonial development.' Some headway has already been made in many fields, although it is in Africa that the greatest scope appears to exist....' In an earlier passage, the chairman mentioned that the increase in the bank's business during the year 'has been perhaps most marked in South Africa.' (*The Economist*, December 13th, 1947).

South Africa's exceptional position as an expanding country was already changing drastically when these words were spoken and the Nationalist victory was an emphatic sign that the immense political backwardness of the country had not been overcome. The political and economic contractionism of the older communities was overtaking the Union. Retaining so many features of her colonial history—autocratic administration over the majority of the population, industry based on cheap labour, etc.—South Africa does not have to travel far in order to attain the pattern of modern colonialism which is most clearly encountered in occupied Germany.

Under these circumstances, the Nationalist Party was returned to power by a very narrow majority.² Its election programme comprised two main points, a promise of social security and a promise of stringent *apartheid* (segregation). The United Party of General Smuts was represented as the organization of the wealthier interests, responsible for the various shortages and the rising cost of living. From the victory of Labour in Britain, the Nationalists, claiming to be the South African counterpart, had drawn great encouragement. But the *apartheid* cry was more important. The United Party, supposed to contain an influential Liberal element and proclaiming the well-sounding 'Christian trusteeship' over the non-European races, was attacked principally on the grounds that its policy was too lax and was undermining the foundations of white supremacy. To 'save white civilization', they affirmed a firm hand was required. That hand is already in evidence.

The Nationalist policy, however, is only to be judged in relation to the general world tendency and the fact that all established white parties are committed to European domination and segregation, to that South African variant of partition which is the greatest drawback to any healthy development of the country. If the Nationalists spoke in favour of total segregation, General Smuts could distinguish himself only by the following election statement: 'We want the native to know, that he is going to get a proper share in the good things and a square deal... I am not talking about letting the natives sit in Parliament or mixing with other sections of the population.' The Nationalists are no heretics but propose to deal

² The Government coalition won 79 seats in the House of Assembly (Nationalists 70, Afrikaner Party 9); the Opposition won 74 (United Party 65, Labour 6, Native Representatives 3). The new Government was in a minority of 1 in the Senate.

more consequentially within the framework of white supremacy and their consequence or rather, let it be said, rigour, is required in this day for a social structure heavily imprinted with contractionism.

Dr. Malan, the present Prime Minister, has warned the Indian community that they must resign themselves to living under restrictions. It is true that in their 'Save White Civilization' campaign the Nationalists had whipped up the ubiquitous racial prejudices which are never so strong as when relative prosperity threatens to wane, and that they backed the country-wide boycott of Indian traders and called for the expulsion of this 'alien and unassimilable element.' But the originators of the anti-Indian movement, its most forceful adherents, were individuals in Natal to whom the Republican propaganda of the Nationalists is anathema. Moreover, under the rule of the United Party, the Indian minority was subject to innumerable disabilities, their position constantly worsening, and official spokesmen fed them only with vague promises of some gradual amelioration in the remote future.

The Cape Coloured (mulatto) community who are under the same Damoclean sword had similarly experienced attacks on their limited rights under Smuts.

It is not much different with the African (negro) majority, the largest section of all, who are the main victims of *apartheid*. No doubt steps contemplated by Smuts but veiled in kindly phraseology will now be taken. 3,000,000 Africans in the Cape Province have the right to elect 3 White M.P.s out of 153 and the total African population of 7,000,000—4 White Senators out of 44. This representation will be abolished together with the Native Representative Council, a body which was allowed to debate but enjoyed no power whatever.

On the fundamental question in South African politics—white domination—the difference between the present Government and its predecessor is one of degree and not of kind. None of the organisations accepting the present order can meet the problems of the country except by restrictive measures—divergences between the main parties should not be allowed to obscure this fundamental fact.

Seen outside the international framework, the significance of what is happening in South Africa is certain to be misunderstood. South Africa has always been dependent on overseas developments. Like Britain, the Union exists by export trade but does not possess the colonial resources of Britain. Indeed it is truer to say that South Africa is among those resources. When the leading nations are oppressed by the problems of contractionism, it becomes more difficult than ever for territories like South Africa to pursue a separate development and break out of a condition of subordination.

The Nationalist Government will be hard put to it if it seeks the course of isolationism and neutrality which is one of its chief tenets. The present world development will have particularly severe effects on a country where enterprises are already conducted on an uneconomic basis and the avowed colour policy of the new Government can only aggravate matters and push South Africa further backward into darkness. The increasing political repression which is on the order of the day can scarcely be confined to the illegalized non-European peoples but must involve wider

and wider sections of society. There are clear indications of such a process already visible.

A campaign has been inaugurated, for instance, to counter 'misrepresentation' at home and abroad. Parliament is to consider, among other things, a Bill empowering the State to withhold or take away passports. The recent attempts by the Ministry of the Interior to seize the passports of anti-segregationists proceeding overseas, like the Rev. Michael Scott, did not succeed for the Supreme Court denied the legality of the Government's action. The Government is responding with the simple creation of a new 'legality.' That dark threats uttered in the Press, which supports the Government, against free expression of Liberal opinion, are not without substance is evidenced in a number of other measures such as the attempt to disfranchise the Native Senator, W. G. Ballinger.

Further efforts of the Government are in accord with this anxiety to silence criticism. Mr. Eric Louw, Minister of Mines and Economic Development, led the recent South African delegation to the U.N.O. in Paris. On his way there, he delivered an apologetic to newspapermen in London. Complaining about the 'misrepresentation' by others of his Government, Mr. Louw argued: 'May I, in all friendliness, suggest that these are our own South African affairs, and that they are not the concern of people in any other country.' (*Manchester Guardian*, October 23rd, 1948). The retort (in all friendliness!) to Mr. Louw is that if his Government had a good case, it need not fear the attention of people in other countries, and that no South African government has yet demonstrated any willingness to practice his precepts, and keep out of the affairs of others. On the contrary. There comes to mind the gratuitous offer of Mr. Oswald Pirow (a man every whit as xenophobic as Mr. Louw) when he was Minister of Defence, to supply the colonial authorities in Northern Rhodesia with bombing planes to assist in settling that 'Northern Rhodesian affair' of the strike of African miners in the Copper Belt in 1939. Nor is it easy to forget statements by highly placed members of Mr. Louw's party advocating ambitions like 'Africa for the Afrikaner.'

The matter, however, is transparent enough. If there is some truth in the assertion that South Africa is a self-governing State for its white minority (and a colony to the non-whites), this must be qualified by referring to the economic weakness of the country. A clear lesson can be learnt, for example, from the behaviour of the Nationalist Government

³ The expansionism arises, of course, out of the country's conditions and is not confined to one party, but where the United Party supporters usually express it in terms of economics (trade with African territories, etc.), the Nationalists tend to view it politically. Thus, the late Dr. N. J. van der Merwe, a leader with Dr. Malan of the Republican wing of the Nationalist movement which separated from General Hertzog when he joined with Smuts in the United Party:— 'The Nationalist Party realises fully that the Union cannot be indifferent towards the rest of Africa. . . In the first place it is of importance for the maintenance of Christian civilization and the perpetuation of the white race in South Africa that Africa should be exclusively under the protection and leadership of powers which represent Western European Christian civilization. In the second place, Africa is the appropriate outlet (*aangewese afsetgebied*) for various agricultural products of the Union and the most natural if not the sole market which offers a prospect of development for South African industries.' p.339, *Dr. Nicolaas Johannes Van Der Merwe*: G. D. Scholtz (Voortrekkerpers Beperk, Johannesburg).

of the late General Hertzog which traded republicanism for 'constitutional independence' within the British Empire and, insisting upon this status during the storms of the world depression of the 1930's, failed to keep the Union on the gold standard after Britain had abandoned gold. And the Nationalist leaders themselves, who have so vehemently attacked British imperialism, have never displayed the slightest compunction in courting the intervention of other foreign powers like Nazi Germany and then the United States.

Under the Nationalist Government, it is probable that South Africa will take many steps towards interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, like the neighbouring British Protectorates. But more important is the likelihood of South Africa's development being interfered with and Nationalist policy is the last thing that can prevent this. The Union, compelled by world events, is involved in the decline from the democratic and rationalist tradition of the Western nations. The present Government are actively engaged in assisting that process. It would be surprising if South African racialism could not find a niche for itself in the general development. Propaganda is being made in the Union for participation in a war against 'The East' which has a special attraction when presented as a crusade against 'equality'. At the same time, Nationalist speakers have no hesitation in correctly warning the non-European races that a Russian tyranny would be no better for them than the present.

At U.N.O., Mr. Louw's counter-attack to 'misrepresentation' included some well-aimed references to the Russian slave camps. He would undoubtedly find himself in a quandary if his opponents were those many millions who neither own nor favour slave camps and who therefore see no cause for complacency in the South African herrenvolk system.

The Cheap Labour Base.

The Nationalist Party, however, does not enjoy the monopoly in preaching white supremacy. Although its leaders are the most vocal protagonists of 'apartheid' it derives a stronger, more substantial support in quarters that usually claim to be Liberal. The dominant influence in South Africa is the gold mining industry, an economic force which burst upon the country in the late 19th century with such disruptive effects that the present society must be regarded as fundamentally its creation. The period was one in which Britain's economic supremacy was first exposed to serious challenge; it was marked by fierce competition for markets and raw materials on the part of the leading industrial nations and the ascendancy of monopoly and finance. It was then, fortunately for Britain, that diamonds and gold were discovered in a land which had been agricultural and largely devoted to pastoral farming. A brief historical recapitulation is necessary.

The agrarian development had been slow but clearly followed the pattern which had obtained in Europe. On the coast a commercialized society had grown up—capital accumulated in the vineyards and wool farms played some role in the exploitation of the diamond fields. The trekters to the hinterland, however, had regressed to a more primitive mode of life, a pastoralism for self-subsistence, but this was increasingly falling under the influence of the coastal market economy and a modern growth

would
between
and av
by slay
Hotten
weak l
permit
two B
but af
were c
1902 v
the su

The
Kruge
to cop
corrup
to mal
rights
for p
propo
which
which
a sha
the S
techni
manag
which

The
still c
the c
propa
conne
enorm
towns
tively
mark
indus
contr
out c
£110

T
establ
for w
State
cf
cf
T
missi
Non-
(inclu
£26,4

would have been inevitable although at the momentum of the snail. Conflict between the trekking Boer and the migrating Bantu tribes, both pastoral and avid for land, had reinforced colour attitudes generated at the coast by slavery, the extermination of the Bushmen and the subjugation of the Hottentots. The racial ideology was then strongest in the economically weak hinterland, whereas at the coast the famous 'Cape Liberalism' had permitted a certain amount of liberty to the non-white community. The two Boer Republics⁴ were in no position to exercise any decisive influence but after the mushroom growth in their midst of the gold mining industry, were crushed in a war that was blatantly engineered by financiers. 1899-1902 was a classical example among imperialist wars of colonial conquest, the sure herald of the new age.

The mining companies had protested against the backwardness of the Kruger Republic with its cost-raising concessions and licences (attempts to cope with the menace of the mining power), its alleged inefficiency and corruption, its tardiness in constructing railways and, above all, its failure to make available cheap labour, 'frozen' on the farms. The lack of franchise rights figured large in the propaganda of the mines but their concern for political liberties must be measured against their opposition to the proposal for a secret ballot.⁵ Most of all they wanted cheap black labour which the Boers required for themselves. After the defeat of the Republics which cost Britain 22,000 lives and some £250,000,000 but resulted in a share-market boom, the mines were in a position to start building up the South Africa of today. Up-to-date machinery was introduced, new technical processes were developed, and a highly efficient system of management and financing was established. The elaborate construction which is called 'Native policy' in South Africa was also brought into being.

Those who guide and control the affairs of the gold mining industry still exercise a pervasive if not always obvious influence on the life of the country through an unchallengeable economic power and through propaganda facilities scarcely equalled outside the dictatorships.⁶ Intimately connected with great British banking houses (and also American), owning enormous tracts of land, controlling industries which dominate whole towns, the mines form an estate to which policy-makers must listen attentively. As the only industry which can compete on a large scale in the world market, gold mining is the economic mainstay of South Africa. 'The industry accounts for almost one-fifth of the nation's net income and contributes over two-fifths of the annual income of the State. Further, out of total yearly exports of £140-150 million, gold now accounts for over £110 million.' When we consider its foreign affiliations, in addition, it

⁴ The Orange Free State and the South African (Transvaal) Republics were established in the 19th century by the Afrikaans trekkers on a democratic basis for whites but 'there shall be no equality between black and white in Church and State'.

⁵ cf. p. 30, *Comrade Bill*: R. K. Cope (Stewart, Cape Town).

⁶ cf. *Behind the Press in South Africa*: H. Lindsay Smith (Stewart).

⁷ Third Interim Report of the Industrial and Agricultural Requirements Commission (1940-41). In 1940, the industry employed 46,502 Europeans and 367,046 Non-Europeans. Respective wages in 1937-38 averaged £400 p.a. and £47.6 (including cash, rations, quarters, etc.) p.a. per head. In 1942, Europeans received £26,400,000, non-Europeans £12,700,000. Dividend payments £16,900,000.

becomes clear that the dominant influence in South Africa has been that of British finance⁸ and there is no puzzle in the fact that the country has been Britain's 'second best customer.'

It is not difficult to understand the persistent discouragement of a local manufacturing industry which is plain in action and sometimes no less plain in words. Gold mining is dependent exclusively on an external market; London is the sole vehicle for the sale of gold; and the industry pushes a 'Buy British' policy which conflicts with the growth of local manufacture. A distorted economy has resulted which presses most heavily on the non-European people whose lives have been correspondingly distorted.

During the nineteenth century, the Bantu had been separated from their traditional relation to the land by a process sometimes reminiscent (in telescoped form) of the English enclosures and were left in possession of nothing but their labour power.¹⁰ This is their sole possession to-day. The mining companies gave the process a catastrophic twist and ensured that the African would be incorporated into their industrial economy but without the opportunity to participate in the benefits of a higher standard of living which industrialization makes possible.

It was recognized that as long as the African had access to land, it was difficult to persuade him to 'go forth and find out something of the dignity of labour' as the cynical Cecil Rhodes blithely put it. Taxation measures provided the 'gentle stimulant' advised by the Empire-builder and so did the complementary agrarian measures like his Glen Grey Act, precursor and prototype of the Reserve system. Private tenure was abolished and the Africans in the Glen Grey district were allotted plots which were inalienable, inadequate and increasingly unable to meet the natural growth of population. The white farmers instigated additional legislation with the object of driving Africans into their employ and keeping them there (Pass Laws, Masters and Servants enactments, etc.). At that time a labour tenancy system was in general use except at the more developed western Cape Coast. The worker rendered an annual term of service in exchange for grazing and arable land on the white-owned farm. But industry had to rely to a great extent on seasonal and casual labour from farms and African areas. The gold mines experienced a constant shortage of labour

⁸ The Rand absorbed £200,000,000 capital between 1887 and 1932, of which £120,000,000 was subscribed abroad; £225,000,000 was paid in dividends, £190,000,000 returned overseas, cf. *Capital Investment in Africa*: Prof. S. H. Frankel. In 1942, according to the Mine Native Wages Commission, 'not more than 50% of dividend payments went abroad'. The preponderance of investment was British. Britain had sent £1,222,000,000 to Africa between 1878 and 1936—the Union took 42.81% of this, cf. Frankel.

⁹ In 1934, 48.4% of Union imports were from the United Kingdom. In 1935, the Union took 68% of the imports to British Africa, cf. Hailey's *African Survey*. This does not include matters like the shipping subsidy, etc. The United States have become Britain's most serious competitor. In 1938, British exports to the Union valued £37,000,000 out of a total of £87,000,000 worth of goods imported into the country. (U.S. £16,500,000.) In 1946—admittedly, an unusual year because of the boom in buying after the war—British exports valued £66,000,000 out of a total of £199,000,000 (U.S. \$57,000,000). The relative proportions are fairly representative.

¹⁰ cf. *The Imperial Factor in South Africa*: Prof. de Kiewiet (Cambridge University Press).

in the early days and 'the average pay of natives was as high as 63s. a month.' (Witwatersrand Mine Natives Wages Commission).

The Reserve cantonments were designed to reduce wages so extravagant as these and to remedy the inadequacy of the supply of workers. The Native Land Act of 1913, which followed a series of similar enactments, was stated to be a comprehensive measure of territorial segregation. This Act, passed by the South African Party Government of the former Boer generals, Botha and Smuts, permitted the African to acquire land only in specified regions—the Reserves—where, it was said, they would be able to live in accordance with their tribal traditions. The 10,000,000 morgen* was out of all proportion to the area open to European farmers (something like 100,000,000 morgen). Taxes remained an additional lever for prising the black man out of his fastnesses into the white wage-economy.

In theory, the Reserves were to provide the African with his means of subsistence and his wage from employment by whites would be a supplementary income for paying taxes and purchasing luxuries. He would need to enter the white sector for brief periods only. That in fact is the argument by which the mines justify their paying black labour far less than is usually paid in the towns and this is pitiful enough.²¹

In conformity with this sort of theory, Mr. Louw bravely wielding his whitewash brush told the journalists in London that 'the policy on the colour issue . . . has been variously represented as one of oppression, racialism, and of unjust discrimination, and the average newspaper reader conjured up a picture of an inarticulate mass of natives under the heel of an oppressor. That was, of course, a ridiculous picture, a false picture painted in lurid colours to create prejudice. Nothing was further from the truth.'

In his manner of argument which illustrates a time-honoured custom of South African politics, Mr. Louw engagingly reminds us of the dialectical bout described in Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*:

Busy: It is profane.

Dionysius: It is not profane.

Busy: It is profane.

Dionysius: It is not profane.

Leatherhead: Well said, confute him with *Not*, still. You cannot bear him down with your base noise, sir.

The 'false picture' is one delineated by a multitude of Government commissions and attested by prominent South Africans in every walk of life.

Supreme Court Judge Krause did not exaggerate when he declared that the African was 'a prisoner in his own land.' General Smuts supplemented that statement when he reminded the white trade unions in 1942 that 'the native is carrying South Africa on his back.'

It is a heavy and a thankless burden. The total population is something like 10,000,000. The 2,000,000 or so whites are entitled to all the formal rights of a democratic society as this is generally understood—universal suffrage; freedom of speech, conscience, movement and assembly; equality before the law. The 7,000,000 Africans enjoy none of these rights, the

²¹ £4 2s. per month for the average man on the Rand; average income per family £5 6s. 8d. per month. (Commission of Inquiry into the Operation of Non-European Bus Services, 1944.)

* 1 morgen is slightly more than 2 acres.

900,000 Cape Coloureds and 350,000 Indians only to a pathetically small degree. The Governor-General as 'supreme chief' has autocratic powers over the Africans in the various Reserves where nearly half dwell. The Transkei territory of the eastern Cape Province with a population of about 1,500,000 is the most important Reserve and the pivot of the whole economy, the basis of the migrant labour system.

The system calls for a mode of existence which is neither tribal nor peasant nor proletarian but combines the disadvantages of all these and is characterized by the extremes of poverty, malnutrition and all the ills to which these give rise. The 'theory' of this state of affairs has been stated *inter alia* by Mr F. Gemmill, chairman of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Recruiting Corporation, in his evidence to the Witwatersrand Mine Native Wages Commission (1941): —

"The basis of the employment of native labour by the mines is in complete accordance with the balanced South African native policy laid down practically unanimously by Parliament after thorough investigation and discussion in 1936-37... In brief, that policy is the enlargement and planned development of the native reserves... It aims at the preservation of the economic and social structure of the native people in native areas where that structure can be sheltered and developed. The policy is a coherent whole, and is the antithesis of the policy of assimilation and the encouragement of a black proletariat in the towns, divorced from its tribal heritage."

To contrast this profession with the facts. The Beaumont Commission, appointed after the passing of the Native Land Act, reported in 1916 that the white farmers (then numbering about 8 per cent. of the population) occupied 87 per cent. of the available soil, the Africans (80 per cent.) only 13 per cent. which was far from being the best land. The average holding was about eight acres, divided on the Glen Grey principle of 'one man, one lot'; the fact that these holdings were and are inalienable being a barrier to improvement.

"The holdings were not big enough to make agriculture a full-time job... Every man must be a small farmer whether he has any ability that way or not... As he cannot concentrate on one job, he cannot become an employer of labour. He is his own builder, painter, shoemaker, smith. There is next to no scope in the Reserves for Natives trained in these handicrafts. There is no division of labour and everybody remains at a low level of skill in all occupations... The district of Glen Grey in which this system has been longest in force is today going backward, and has been going backward for years."¹²

The Beaumont Commission recommended the addition of a further 18,000,000 morgen but, as late as 1936, when General Hertzog introduced his 'balanced South African native policy', nothing had been done. 7,500,000 morgen extra were promised in the teeth of strong opposition by farming representatives in Parliament but it transpires that only 3,000,000 morgen have since been acquired.¹³

The over-crowding, over-stocking and over-cultivation of the Reserves are

¹² Native Economic Commission (1932).

¹³ cf. *All Union Politics Are Native Affairs*: Margaret Ballinger, M.P. (S.A. Affairs Pamphlets No. 4, Johannesburg).

notorious. 'A native area can be distinguished at sight by its barrenness', commented the Native Economic Commission (1932). At least half the food of these agricultural regions has to be imported: unremitting toil fails to provide the population's minimum subsistence needs.¹⁴ But just because of this generalized indigence, 'the gold mining industry is able, in spite of the competition owing to the increased demands of secondary industries, to recruit native labour for underground work at a cash wage of 2s. per shift'. (Witwatersrand Mine Native Wages Commission).

The migrant labourer's wages are so low because they do not include, as is usual in industry, the cost of the upkeep of a wife and family. To the mines, their black workers are bachelors and with a supplementary income at that. Lucky fellows!

So Mr. Gemmill informed the commission:

'The ability of the Native to earn a Reserve's income is largely due to the fact that he is granted by the Union Government land to cultivate and pasturage, with practically free occupation of both; in effect, he receives in this way a substantial subsidy from the Government which enables him to come out to work in the intermittent fashion which suits him and accords with his historical background and circumstances.'

Apart from the increasing destruction of soil resources, aggravated by the absence of the able-bodied men, great numbers of Africans in the Reserves no longer possess any land at all, and they are becoming more numerous. Among other things, this is reflected in the longer periods which migrant labourers now spend in the mines. More and more the African has to depend for subsistence on wages earned in the white economy. The mines have been the chief agent in the creation of a more permanent proletariat in the towns and this, of course, is not to their liking. Tribal labour is more easily managed in its pristine state. The delicate accuracy of mine book-keeping is not achieved by placing human conditions on a higher level than reduction of costs. In all its dealings the mining interest utilises 'mass production' methods. The migrant labourers live in large enclosed barracks, known as compounds, under constant supervision,¹⁵ they are fed in communal kitchens

¹⁴ 'The density of the total Union population in 1941 was 14.67 per square mile, whites 3.87, Transkei 94.3. 'The authorities which the Commission has consulted are almost unanimous in their opinion that these Reserves are over-populated and over-stocked; that they do not produce sufficient for the population to live on; that their productive capacity is decreasing; and that the general health of the Reserve population is unsatisfactory.' W.M.N.W.C.—Dr. Mary McGregor, of the Umtata Health Unit, told the 1941 Overstocking Committee: 'Nearly 50 per cent of the babies born alive in Umtata district died before reaching the age of two years and . . . 60 per cent. of those deaths was due to some form of diarrhoea nearly always of the fermentation type due to an excess of carbohydrates in the blood. . . . Medical work in Transkei becomes increasingly disheartening as it becomes increasingly obvious that the biggest enemy is *malnutrition*—*The medical problem rapidly becomes one beyond the scope of the medical man.*'

¹⁵ 'In the newest compounds usually 16 to 20 men are accommodated in one room; in the oldest compounds there are as many as 40 occupants to a room. In the great majority of cases the sleeping places consist of concrete berths, divided from each other by concrete partitions. This type of berth is hard and, according to European standards, affords little opportunity for comfort, but a more serious objection is that it is cold.' W.M.N.W.C. The compound system has been adopted throughout the country, especially by large-scale enterprises, including municipalities.

on a uniform ration, and even their recreation is mostly 'organised' (the preference of the management being for tribal contests which act as a safety-valve for emotions otherwise dangerous and perpetuate backward hostilities among the Africans themselves). The consequences of phthisis, of enforced celibacy, the conspicuous lack of choice in the most elementary matters, the disruption of family life and Reserve life—these are not registered in the ledgers.

The migrant worker naturally learns certain skills in the mines but the colour-bar laws prevent him from rising to the status and privileges of the artisan. He has no means within the law of improving his conditions even to the standard of other unskilled labour. For, according to the mines, if they

'were suddenly compelled to pay for unskilled labour a wage which would be adequate for a native living with his family in or in the neighbourhood of the Witwatersrand, the dislocating effect upon the gold mining industry would be catastrophic'. (Mine Native Wages Commission).

Let us shed a tear for the industry before we wonder about the dislocating effect of the gold mines upon African life.¹⁰

The expanding mines long felt the inadequacy of the Reserve Labour supply, and about two decades ago, made a start with importing workers from beyond the Union—half the migrant force now comes from territories like Portuguese Africa, the British Protectorates, the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Conditions in these regions are even more backward than in the Union and the 'foreign' labour helps to depress the standards of the South African Bantu.

The fact remains that the mining economy has not perpetuated the tribal institutions of the African but has destroyed them. Urbanisation is a pronounced phenomenon. The movement, however, is not from the Reserves alone but also from the white-owned farms where some 2,000,000 Africans are employed. Here, too, a steady deterioration in their condition has forced an ever larger flow into the towns, entry into which is barred by a host of stringent laws.¹¹ The drift to the towns which nonetheless continues is

¹⁰ cf. William Plomer's vivid description in his story, *Ula Masondo (I Speak of Africa or in Four Countries)*.

¹¹ Some of the laws relating to Africans follow:—

Native Service Contract Act prevents an African in rural areas from obtaining employment without written authorisation by his previous employer and is binding on his children to the age of 18 years.

The Natives (Urban Areas) Act requires an African to obtain a permit if he wishes to seek employment in the towns. If he fails to find work in the stated period (7-14 days), he must leave if he cannot get the permit renewed. The local authorities are required to take a census of Africans every two years and to estimate the number 'necessary to supply the reasonable labour requirements' of the area. Any superfluous material may be evicted. The urban laws are particularly stringent against the entry of African women into the towns.

The Pass laws are too numerous to mention here. It will suffice to say that each African has to carry a veritable library of documents which he must show the police on demand although the few fortunate possessors of an exemption pass need only show that as proof that they do not come under the Pass laws.

Finally, the Riotous Assemblies Act should be referred to, a measure which enables magistrates to prohibit public gatherings and to penalise the free expression of opinion. It has scarcely ever been invoked against Europeans, except, e.g., garment workers on strike.

evidence of a process in the rural areas caused by the development of a market economy and State encouragement. The tenant-labourer has been transformed into a wage-labourer. Rising land values made it no longer possible to allow squatters to use land from which profit could be derived, wages were increasingly paid, and the last links of the rural African with his past habits are being snapped. Over half the Africans on white-owned farms are now wage-earners. But wages are not subject to the play of competition—the rural African is still a bound labourer for whom it is difficult to change masters let alone leave the land. It suits the farmer to employ on a seasonal basis and the rural African, because of this and his general poverty, has to seek casual work elsewhere for the periods, when he is not employed on farmwork. The laws drive him to the rural areas, economic pressure drives him to the towns; the upshot is that he leads a fluctuating half-existence which prevents improvement of rural conditions and simultaneously lowers the standards of permanently urbanised Africans who have to compete with a perennial influx of casual workers, prepared to accept lower payment. 'The labour market is in a chronic state of chaos. No regular class of urban labour gets a chance to develop because those Natives who remain permanently in town are always subjected to the disturbing influence on wage rates of a large supply of unskilled labour. Without some degree of permanence in the labour force, no high degree of efficiency can be expected'.¹⁸ The African has become completely dependent on employment by Europeans in a wage-economy but under conditions of instability and utter lack of human opportunities.

Urbanisation

Contemporary South African politics hinge on the continuing emigration into the cities which coincides with the expansion of secondary industry. Urbanisation involves all sections of the population but it involves most of all the Afrikaans-speaking section of the whites and the Africans. It has brought the question of the colour bar in industry to a more acute pitch than ever before.

Originally the status of the artisan was an economic rather than a racial phenomenon, dating from the earliest days of mining when skilled workers had to be brought from overseas at high wages. The mining oligarchy has repeatedly attempted to undermine the position of the white worker, as a rule with the Liberal slogan of 'fair play for the Native', but one of the most representative statements was made by the mining magnate, Albu, in the *Mining Review*, 1907: 'Why not make the native the real miner, nominally as well as virtually, and thus save much of the money paid to white men for work they never perform?'¹⁹ The 1922 strike, crushed by the State forces under Smuts, was occasioned by such an attempt, and, after 1924, the white Labour movement instigated the colour laws in industry.

The colour bar was strengthened by the influx of landless Europeans into the cities. The commercialisation of agriculture expedited the concentration of land. The extent to which this has taken place may be surmised from the 1936 figures given in the last *Union Year Book* (1941), which show that

¹⁸ Native Economic Commission.

¹⁹ cf. *Comrade Bill*.

6.49 per cent. of European-owned holdings (the largest single holdings) covered 42.5 per cent. of the available area, while, of the smallest European-owned holdings, 35 per cent. covered only 9.79 per cent. of the land. That does not include the considerable proportion of the white population who possess no land at all, the 300,000 or so Poor Whites.²⁰ The Poor Whites, whose votes are bargained for by the political parties with platform bribes of State aid and appeals to race prejudice, are themselves the direct victims of white supremacy. Cheap black labour blocks their entry into every sphere of unskilled work, while the process which transformed the rural African into a wage labourer could only transform the *bywoner*, the white squatter, into a vagrant with no place in society.

The ranks of the Poor White have been augmented by the continued displacement from the land which was especially acute during the inter-war years when there was an international drop in agricultural prices and one State after another set up tariff barriers. To check the European drift from the land and to cope with the white influx in the towns, the Government of the day did not introduce urban area acts nor pass laws but voted subsidies. Unskilled white labour was absorbed into public projects at 'civilized' rates of pay (numbers of Indian, Coloured and African employees being discharged as, for example, from the State-owned railways) and protection to private manufacturing industry became contingent on the employment of a quota of white labour at 'civilized' standards of pay. For the farmer, the State provided not only loans at low rates of interest but also discriminatory railway tariffs, elevator and storage facilities, cheap shipping, and not least, export subsidies administered by marketing boards with a virtually monopolistic control of domestic prices which are often double those on the foreign markets for the same Union produce. Indeed, the foreign policy of the Union has been directed almost exclusively to building up an export agricultural industry and this is very strange because the Union is not one of the most suitable countries for this activity.

The financial assistance given to South African agriculture reaches large total figures. Excluding the exceptionally low railway rates usually charged on farm produce, the State has spent about £25,000,000 in ten years (1931-32 to 1940-41) in direct assistance to farmers. In addition, over £1,000,000 a year is spent on research, precautionary measures, administration and in dissemination of information. Large amounts are furthermore contributed by consumers under various protective and price-raising measures.²¹

In effect, the agricultural protection and assistance policy has been an incentive to soil erosion, a most serious menace in South Africa, and has contributed greatly to the grave malnutrition which is encountered among

²⁰ I have given the figure usually cited but some estimates place the number as high as 800,000. The Carnegie Commission reported in 1932 that 22% of the white population were pauperised, 34% were unable to feed, clothe, house or educate their children. Official figures provide the information that over 40% of European schoolboys were suffering from malnutrition before the war.

²¹ Third Interim Report, which notes that only 15% of the land's surface is cultivable and the greater portion is more suited to livestock breeding than to the cropping which now predominates.

wide sections of every national group.²² Among the farmers themselves, there are those opposed to a policy which impedes technical advance and tends to place inordinate power in the hands of the wealthiest interests. However, the needs of the backward farming, which is encouraged by State policy, stimulate an insatiable demand for land and cheap labour, one of the propelling factors in the agitation for the incorporation of South West Africa and the British Protectorates. The primitive condition of the workers already bound to farming is not only perpetuated in this way but also the extension and aggravation of bondage is required. The subsidisation of farming is pre-eminently a measure dictated by political considerations at the expense of the general economic welfare and is an influence which acts as a continuous drag towards backwardness. The most pronounced, the most articulate and vehement opposition to urbanisation comes from those quarters which benefit by subsidisation and which demand a drastic reversal of the process.

By contrast, the manufacturing industries have exercised a pull townwards. Before the war, there had been no export market of any consequence for South African manufactures; the only possibility for expansion was seen to be the creation of a home market, involving in the nature of things a rise in the consumptive capacity of the non-European majority. As this could only be effected through the transformation of the Reserve and rural African into a peasantry with free access to the soil and the right of owning private property in land and the development of the urban African as a stable proletariat (not always recognised), secondary industry found itself entangled in obstruction by the existing frame of things at every turn. In opposition to the mining *cum* agriculture economy, the manufacturing industries became the source of a current of Liberalism that, during the war in particular, affected every stratum of the population.

But practically every economic demand of manufacture raised political issues right at the heart of South African affairs. The controversy regarding the training of African builders which became a test case in the last few years provides an illustration. Non-European housing in the cities, always bad, had reached a peak of urgency during the war. In 1909, only 608,000 Africans dwelt in urban areas—today, there are over double that number on the Witwatersrand alone. By law, urban Africans are compelled to reside in segregated municipally-owned and controlled locations.²³ Atrociously

²² 'A minimum of £7,500,000 of farmers' incomes was in the nature of a transfer to them from other sections of the population.' *Ibid.* 'Compensation' leads to anomalies, e.g. 'The assistance given so stimulated sugar and maize production that the output increased and with it the export surplus and export loss, so that further assistance was required. It was duly given.' Assistance is an incentive to extend production into unsuited areas—hence those expanses of veld which have in recent years emerged to rival the glories of the Karroo. Assistance 'merely keeps inefficient farmers on the land and perpetuates or even accentuates unhealthy farming practices.'

²³ 'The worker is compelled to live far away from his work, and must in most cases pay for his transport to and from work. The tax must be paid, or he may find himself in gaol. Owing to the compulsion imposed upon Africans by State policy and housing requirements, rent and transport should always be considered together, and these together take too high a proportion of the family income. They save on food and most are in a state of hunger. Continuous life and work in confined space and often in impure air takes its toll of the worker's strength—their sole capital—and of their children's lives. And most families appear to be burdened with debt.' (Bus Services Commission.)

overcrowded even under 'normal' circumstances, these could not cope with an additional influx of impoverished human beings from Reserves and farms. This migration was mostly 'illegal' according to the laws of South Africa and certainly contrary to official policy which is to discourage permanent urbanisation of any large numbers of non-Europeans. Since the authorities could not provide these people with housing, even up to location standards, they built their own accommodation and set up those proliferations of shanty towns—Sofasonke, Tobruk, etc.—which are the scandal of every South African urban area. The following description by the Cape Flats Commission of 1943 is quite typical:

'The pondokkie of the Cape Flats, in its design owes nought to any school of architecture, European or Asiatic, ancient or modern. Its conception is determined entirely by the scraps of material which go into its structure, pieces of corrugated iron, old tins and drums, rough bones, sacking, anything which can possibly afford protection against the weather. Piece by piece, scrap material is bought, begged or filched and added to make room for a growing family. There are no windows, ceilings, and very often no door. Sanitation is non-existent. Many of these hovels would do a disservice to animals'.

The Reserves are many miles away from the main centres of population but the shanty-towns and locations, although on the peripheries of the cities, became a matter which could not be easily ignored if only for the fear of the diseases which were bred there. But, above all, as can be seen, a permanent urban working population is vital for industry, and housing became a crucial issue. The Government of the time (under General Smuts) proposed a programme of sub-economic housing; the dwellings were to be erected by non-European artisans, and a start was to be made by training 50 Africans on the precedent of the COTT scheme.

The COTT plan had been introduced during the war to meet the needs of expanding munitions industries. Normally entry into a skilled trade is limited by regulations usually laying down a five-year period of training with a quota usually of five apprentices to each journeyman. Under the COTT plan, the number of trainees was not so rigorously limited and by the use of modern methods the period of training was cut down to about six months.

The application of this scheme to non-European housing was howled down by the building unions as an attempt to drive the thin edge of a wedge into the status of the skilled worker and threatened the instructors of the 50 Africans with expulsion from the union unless they resigned. Undoubtedly the scheme was also intended to assail the standards of the white worker but by counterposing the traditional slogan of 'Equal Pay for equal work', the building unions ensured in a segregationist society that non-European labour would not be employed and that the houses would not be erected. An African cannot pay the rent for a house built by men earning three or four times his own wage.

But the case is equally illustrative of the restrictions which segregation imposes on the white workers themselves, as a whole. For the same objections were raised by the unions to the continuance of the COTT scheme in peace-time where only white workers were concerned. And, of course,

such obstacles to industrialisation narrow the field of employment for white workers and adversely affect the general consuming public.

In every field, an identical situation arises. South Africa possesses the basic raw materials for an industrial development—it has always been inhibited by the racial structure and the stranglehold of mines, farmers and privileged workers. The agriculturists employ no white manual labour, the mines compensate for the white wage by the employment, on an average, of seven migrant workers to every European miner but the ratio of black to white in manufacture is more like two to one.²⁴ The impulsion to reduce the cost structure in secondary industry by greater use of black labour (and cheaper white labour) is profound indeed, especially as skilled wages are 'high in relation to the output per employee in South African industry when compared with the *per capita* output in other industrial countries'. (Third Interim Report).²⁵

The attempt by the mining industry to have a final showdown with its white workers resulted in the 1922 general strike. The strikers were defeated militarily but they succeeded politically when a Nationalist-Labour coalition was returned to power in 1924. Once legislation had entrenched their position, the skilled workers wished to maintain the *status quo* unchanged and the rising manufacturing industries became the centre of conflict. The white workers in secondary industry, newly arrived from the depressed rural areas where segregationist ideology has deep roots, faced not only competition by cheap black labour but also impediments to improving their position in the very measures which safeguarded the earlier artisans. The Afrikaner from the countryside had to repeat the class struggle of the mine-workers but suffering great handicaps and without the scope for attaining as exceptional a standard of life. The Industrial Conciliation Act made legal strike action difficult and encumbered collective bargaining in red tape. The apprenticeship laws made entry into skilled trades possible only for small numbers, and the 'closed shop' agreements with employers channelised labour action into the restrictive trade unions. The Labour Party and the unions now really represented only a minority of the white workers. The new wave of strikes in the 30's broke out beyond the framework of established Labour and often reached further than wage demands in search of new political perspectives but the fatality was segregationist illusion and prejudice.

From that time onward, the Labour movement differentiates increasingly

²⁴ In 1944-45, manufacturing industry employed over 165,000 white workers and 311,000 non-whites. [About £5 a week was a good wage for the white operative in war-time, £2 a week very good for a non-European.] An interesting and significant phenomenon is the large proportion of European women whose wages are lower than those of the men. 1921-36, 61.5% increase in men employed; women increased from 12,700 to 28,600, i.e. to 25.2% of the total white labour then employed.

²⁵ 'The greatest competitive drawback of South African industry is the high cost of European labour, and the protection which exists is largely a protection of the wage rates payable to Europeans in industry in South Africa.' (Customs Tariff Commission, 1925). According to the Third Interim Report, net output per employee in Canada is £446 a year but in South Africa only £242 per year. White wages in secondary industry, however, are lower on the whole than those paid to artisans and prior to the rise of the new trade unions were rather close to those of the African. In 1926, it was £60 per year in a number of occupations. (In 1929, State-subsidised white labourers were receiving from £6 10s. to £10 per month.)

into three wings:—(a) the entrenched strata of skilled workers whose powerful organizations collaborate with State and employers (the mining employers, in particular) in order to avoid change and which confine themselves to more or less minor economic demands; (b) a Liberal wing which under the influence of secondary industrialization advocates economic amelioration for the non-Europeans but nothing approaching complete removal of the colour bar. Concerned to broaden the basis of the Labour movement so that it should include larger sections of the white working class, this grouping proposes measures which could only strengthen the State (e.g. conscription of manpower, wealth and industry); (c) a radical wing urging better conditions for the new workers but on a 'Europeans Only' basis, opposed to the other two tendencies, more politically conscious than either, its aim increasingly becomes one of transforming the white Labour movement into a completely racialist affair. Its leadership is derived from circles impregnated with the ideology of the white farming strata. Seeking the exclusion of competing black labour, it tends to pay less attention to economic demands than to the phantasms of white supremacy politics. Thus, it falls easily into the trap of Statification and—sometimes in the name of democracy—helps to dissolve the democratic elements in the labour movement.

The Liberal wing became very influential in the Labour movement during the war but as the prospects of the continuance of war-time expansion faded and the old racial tensions gained fresh intensity, its behaviour became more and more vacillating, and faced with the first serious political issue, requiring a clear attitude on human rights—the Indian Bills—the Labour Party (and later the trade unions) disintegrated into the three components, losing out to the United Party and the Nationalists in the process. It was illustrative of the weaknesses within Liberalism in South Africa.

To discuss this phenomenon with anything like accuracy, certain distinctions are of importance. The Liberal tradition, originating in the European Enlightenment and passing through the British humanitarian movement of the nineteenth century, found a certain scope at the Cape, especially after the abolition of slavery and with the development of the market. It was possible for the Cape Coloured people to become integrated into Western society on a more democratic basis than has usually been the case in South Africa. The Cape Coloured community, never tribal, enjoyed the franchise, supplied a skilled as well as unskilled working class and were able to produce the most substantial non-European intelligentsia. But this Cape Liberalism, which was political in its outlook, was superseded by an 'economic Liberalism' on the coming of the mines which, seeking to diminish production costs, adopted the guise of a benevolent negrophilism. Extension of the non-European franchise was never pressed and, in fact, non-European rights have steadily decreased under the influence of the rural segregationists since the beginning of the century.

The mines have been responsible for the establishment of a number of institutions which sponsor Liberal ideas but it is a Liberalism contained within well-circumscribed limits. It has performed some valuable educational work but working for reform of abuses rather than for a drastic change in the 'coherent whole' which is the source of abuse, it channelises progressive thought into support of the existing order from which, it teaches in effect,

all blessings must flow. Insofar as it concentrates on economic questions, which cannot be resolved without political change, it plays into the hands of such unprincipled politicians as General Smuts who is at all times lavish with promises of economic reform when he desires to detract attention from his political repressions. (In compensation for the 'ghetto' clauses of the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act, he conjured up the vision of better housing, educational and other amenities, promises which the Indian community knew well from sad experience to estimate at their right value. Dr. Malan emulates this procedure when he tells the Coloured community that their removal from the voters' roll and segregation will mean better economic opportunities). Secondary industry has pronounced its claims in a more vigorous tone, but if the voice has on occasion been that of an intransigent Esau, the hand has in practice been compelled to fall on the coat-tails of the Chamber of Mines. Running within the parallel lines of the mining Liberalism, the secondary industrialists, as a group, have not been able to attempt the political tasks involved in destroying the agricultural subsidy system and the migrant basis of labour. But it is precisely the disfranchisement of so great a proportion of the population that is responsible for their economic thralldom and for the continued existence of an irrational economic set-up, the effects of which are becoming more insidious than ever in an age of State dictatorships. South Africa, like other colonies, because of its lack of development, experienced the beginnings of the over-running by the State of all fields sooner than the more advanced countries; monopoly is visibly reaching its ultimate conclusion in South Africa to the detriment of the consumption goods industries as of all other progressive forces. The following quotation is illuminating:

"Many semi-autonomous bodies or so-called Public Utility Corporations have in recent years been established in South Africa, e.g. the Electricity Supply Commission, Iscor, the Industrial Development Corporation, the National Road Board, the South African Broadcasting Corporation, the Tourist Development Corporation Board of Control, etc. (Many other bodies, e.g. the innumerable Marketing Boards, cannot in any case be regarded as Public Utility Corporations). They can be divided into two types: those charged with providing a product or service, and those charged with performing a service. But, many exhibit the same unfortunate feature: they are not Public Utility Corporations in the *real* sense, i.e., directed and controlled by a Board composed of joint representatives of Government and the public, operating solely in the public interests, and readily amenable and subject to reasonable public control through Parliament: they are creations of the State virtually independent of reasonable public control: '*imperia in imperio*', States within States. The term Public Utility Corporation was never intended to be interpreted in this way, and no more Public Utility Corporations should be set up in this country unless this defect is remedied, and the Acts governing those already in existence which exhibit this feature should be amended to provide for more adequate and reasonable public control, and more susceptibility to reasonable and enlightened public criticism in the public interest. Public Utility Corporations were originally developed to get rid of the adverse features of private monopoly, to

provide for the economies of large-scale operation, and to combine the best features of private enterprise and initiative with the conception not of private profit but of public good. In many cases, however, it has resulted in the establishment of State Bureaucratic Monopolies, susceptible really to no law, relieved of the obligations imposed by company law on legitimate forms of private enterprise, and not subject to the private criterion of efficiency, profits. This is surely getting the worst of both worlds, not the best: and it opens wide the door to the intrusion of totalitarianism, the realization of the all-prevading State, and is diametrically opposed to any true conception of democratic organization. Monopolies, and particularly State monopolies, are a serious feature of economic life in South Africa, and deserve immediate investigation, and require immediate remedy.' (Quoted by Professor C. S. Richards, in his Presidential address to the Economic Society of South Africa, from a previous article by him, in the *South African Journal of Economics*, September, 1944).

Professor Richards has hit the nail on the head (bearing in mind the great deficiencies of South African Parliamentarism in particular) for many other countries besides South Africa. Monopoly extends into every sphere of South African life and the interesting fact is the closeness of association between the State and the private monopoly, an association which is evidently growing closer and encroaching everywhere. South African secondary industry, mostly conducted in the form of small-scale enterprises, has never been able to challenge the established and growing monopolies effectively and the State increasingly thwarts its aspirations.

Indications of the process are legion. The mining industry, itself controlled by a handful of financing houses, has taken over the direction of manufacture and forces it into a pattern in which the supply of the consumers' needs of the general public at home becomes the least important consideration. That the mining corporations are partners with the State in nationalized concerns, and that the leaders of State industry sit on the directorates of mining subsidiaries should not surprise us if we have grasped the basic tendency of the age.²⁸

Concentration has come about not merely by the operation of economic forces such as competition on the foreign market with American and British production and the fact that throughout the territories of British Africa (the Union's 'natural market') import barriers give preference to British exports to the detriment of South African but also as a result of State intervention. The State, paying heed only to the interests of mining and subsidized agriculture, has co-operated actively with the monopolizing

²⁸ The outstanding case is that of the late Dr. Van der Bijl, managing director of Iscor, the State steel industry, and governing a number of other nationalised enterprises. Invited by the British Labour Government to advise on and take charge of steel nationalization in Britain, he sat on a number of directorates of the Anglo-American Corporation's affiliates—this Corporation shares Iscor with the Government and also *inter alia* the diamond monopoly. Dr. Van der Bijl caused the Nationalist Press (which had upheld him as a paragon among nationalists) much heartburning when in one of his annual reports to Iscor, he stoutly defended private enterprise and profit.

forces and connived at the suppression of local manufacture.²⁷ The International Trade Agreement in Geneva in 1947, for instance, found the Union delegates (without a mandate from Parliament and enshrouded with secrecy) subscribing to a policy of tariff reductions which throws the South African market wide open to American and British competition but provides no reciprocal advantages for local manufacture.

Analysis of the war-time expansion discloses that only the engineering, metal and food processing branches have emerged with any prospects and it is precisely these which are most in the net of monopoly and the older established interests. The drive towards concentration, moreover, is coincident here as elsewhere with militarism. It is well known that South Africa had been selected as the chief military base in the British Empire defence of Africa. The metal, engineering and food processing plants flourished during the last war as a result of military requirements and would be stimulated by the future military development.

These tendencies underlie the defeats of Liberalism in South Africa in recent years. The crack-up in the Labour Party was parallel with a decline in Liberal hopes in quarters where fulfilment was most sought, the United Party of Smuts. The deadly paralysis of mining-agricultural domination had not been remedied.

White politics in South Africa are characterized by rapprochements and splits, by changes which turn out to be no changes, for these politics function within a framework that permits no relaxation of the sacrosanct colour bar. The mining interest which knows how to mobilize opinion 'to safeguard the rights of the English-speaking section' and in the interests of 'fairness to the non-Europeans' would be unable to exert any decisive influence in the government of the country unless it was able to call in a fairly large measure of support from the other dominant interest, agriculture, with its rigid segregationism. It should be mentioned that simultaneously with the deruralization of sections of white farmers and their gravitation towards Poor Whiteism, the wealthier farmers tend to enter industry.²⁸ The stratum of wealthier farmers, it is notable, supplies the agricultural M.P.s of both Nationalist and United Parties. Of those most actively interested in business and industry, a figure like the present Minister of Finance, Mr. N. C. Havenga, leader of the Afrikaner Party, stands as a symbol, and the Afrikaner Party indeed is regarded as repre-

²⁷ 'The refusal of every South African Premier since 1910 to create a separate Minister for manufacturing industry ranking in importance with mining and agriculture, long typified the dominance of the agricultural and mining interests', complained *Industry and Trade* (Feb., 1948). 'That the Prime Minister continues to look upon it (the Ministry of Economic Development) as a "junior" post can mean only that the economic interests of industrial development—which now unquestionably coincide with the interests of the whole country—will continue to be subordinated to the political influence and dominance of transportation, mines and agriculture.'

²⁸ A reverse process whereby business interests entered agriculture was most marked during the war. The growth of the food processing industry is very significant in the merging of the two.

senting a policy midway between the Nationalists and the U.P.²⁹ But while the United Party ruled, it contained this farming element, strongly opposed to urbanization; those who sympathize with the mining industry; and the representatives of secondary industry, the most energetic agitators for 'economic production.' Like the Labour Party, Smuts' organization began to show signs of breaking up as the war drew to a close. The most vociferous segregationists moved nearer the Nationalists and in some cases actually transferred their allegiances to that Party, a process which has continued. The secondary industry wing campaigning against agricultural subsidization, for a more advanced colour policy and against bureaucratization,³⁰ increasingly found itself quelled and losing its identity as a separate force. The mines had the last word. The Liberals were unable to adopt the firm stand needed in matters like the Marketing Bill Amendment Act (a 'revolt' of 30 M.P.s was rumoured but came to nothing) and the Asiatic legislation. The experience is typical of the episodic nature of struggles for a more democratic order in South Africa, arising from their compartmentalization and failure to see the interrelatedness of all democratic actions, no matter how slight and remote they may appear. But it is equally an illustration of the manner in which Statification creates opposition in the most diverse milieus.

Perhaps this is better exemplified by the Nationalist Party which, in power, is involved with increasing contradictions and conflicts of interest in its own ranks. Traditionally, the party of agriculture and of the Afrikaans-speaking section, the Nationalist Party attained power through the support not only of the wealthy and middle strata of farmers but also of the impoverished whites and Afrikaans-speaking workers. In addition, an Afrikaans industrialist group had grown up in recent years. Beginning to a great extent in a plan for the rehabilitation of the poor whites, the 'Afrikaans economic movement' developed as a conscious and organized attempt to capture a 'rightful share' of business and industry on a racial basis. But in the course of development the movement, backed up by the Nationalist Party as its 'economic front' (there is also the 'cultural front' and the 'Church front') and part of the 'conquest of the cities', has tended to merge with the established industrialists, both physically and in outlook.³¹

²⁹ Men, like Mr. Havenga, however, must be distinguished from participants in the conscious and originally, at least, Afrikaans racial 'economic movement'. The chief organ of Mr. Havenga and the Afrikaner Party, the Johannesburg daily newspaper, *Die Vaderland*, has repeatedly editorialized against the racial, i.e. anti-British, attitude to commerce.

³⁰ The secondary industrialists oppose, e.g. 'the economic colour bar, mediæval apprenticeship regulations, completely unrealistic classification of labour categories, insistence on unnecessarily high ratios of skilled to unskilled workers, obstruction to improving skills of Natives and other non-European workers...' (*S.A. Industry and Trade*, Nov., 1947). This is a fair indication of the horizon of manufacturing industry.

³¹ At the first Afrikaans Economic Congress in 1939, Prof. L. J. du Plessis, a leader of the 'economic movement' and former 'policy chief' of the O.B., stated: 'Hitherto, Afrikaners have adopted the imported Capitalist economic system, which is of a British-Jewish character, and also the British-Jewish mentality with its cosmopolitan profiteering and its cosmopolitan mode of life.' One of the main obsessions of the conference was the estimated £100,000,000 buying power of the Afrikaans community which, it was hoped, could be made to flow only into

A prosperous minority have succeeded in linking up with the monopolists and the others have come to realize that the root problem of small scale secondary industrialists is the disabilities of the non-Europeans. But like the other manufacturers, they speak less and less as an organized group and become lone voices to which it is necessary to add those individuals and circles in the Nationalist movement who, for different reasons (intellectual, religious, etc.) find themselves unable to tolerate the excesses of white supremacy dogma.²²

Numerically the most important supporters now of Nationalism, the working class and the poorer sections constitute their most important problem. During the war, the Ossewa Brandwag (Ox-wagon Guard), a republican movement embracing the aspirations of the disoriented and poorer Afrikaners, occupied a great deal of public attention. Originally, this body, which started with a following of hundreds of thousands, and engaged in anti-war sabotage and fascistic propaganda, was lauded by Nationalist leaders like Dr. Malan. The Nationalist Party was then described as the 'Parliamentary front' of Afrikanerdom, and the O.B. the 'volksfront', i.e. the national front ('Volk' has mystical implications which are untranslatable). But soon, the two fronts diverged, competed and engaged in an increasingly bitter feud which has not ended. The O.B. advancing the claim that it is 'social in its nationalism' and 'national in its socialism' criticized the Nationalist Party as being the organization of wealthier, more conservative strata. This current in the republican and segregationist movement is manifested in the 'Afrikaans Christian trade unions' which both the Nationalist Party and the O.B. support vigorously.

The Nationalist Party, in power, becomes the centre of struggle for the conflicting white interests—mines, agriculture, industry and working class—and clearly it will founder as it did in the past. And one thing is certain—that the Nationalists can only attempt to meet these troubles, which its policy breeds, by extending the autonomous and exclusive authority of the State. The State monopoly wings of industry are everywhere in the ascendant and throw everywhere into opposition the sections of industry which are not economically decisive and therefore expendable. The victimization of the weaker sections of industry will dispel illusions about reform within the given channels and transform their grievances as they splinter,

Afrikaans businesses. In 1945, Prof. du Plessis was writing in *Volkshandel* (March) that Afrikanerdom as 'a purposeful, organised body had come to stay in the commercial world. . . . They were now strong enough and need no longer fear "co-operation" . . . English-speaking elements who are South-African-orientated (or would like to become so orientated)' should become 'connected with our larger enterprises'. While *Die Transvaler* (February 20th, 1945), the daily newspaper of the Transvaal Nationalists, refers to 'the disquietening tendency of Afrikaners' to emulate the formation of trusts and cartels. The last word is that of Mr. Watkins, reporting to the Bloemfontein Chamber of Commerce on the merger between the Associated Chamber of Commerce and the Afrikaans Commercial Institute: 'In the last instance commerce has only one language. It is not English and it is not Afrikaans. It is international and consists of three letters—L.S.D.' (*The Friend* of July 24th, 1946).

²² Examples are the editors of South Africa's leading literary magazine, *Standpunte*, whose journal is thrown open to cultural expression in *all* the languages of the Union, and those ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church who have opposed synodal resolutions declaring that segregation is based on the Bible. There are many others.

into those of all other groupings in their variegation: into a political expression of resistance which becomes, in essence, a fight to preserve democratic right. The Nationalist Government has inaugurated its career with a series of promised political repressions in the interests of 'apartheid' and the suppression of agitators. It has opened a campaign against the relatively Liberal tendencies where they exist in the trade unions. It threatens to tamper with the constitution and to render it even more undemocratic than it is by removing in an unconstitutional manner the 'entrenched clauses' securing the Cape Coloured franchise rights. Incursions into the right of freedom of conscience, notably in the educational sphere, are foreshadowed. The role of the followers of Stalin has not been one to boast of in the Union any more than in other countries—their anti-segregationism has been purely opportunistic—but anti-Communist suppressions by the State violate fundamental democratic principles and will obviously be used against all other forms of opposition. The road to the monopoly State is paved with many suppressions. The O.B. has predicted attempts to ban them by the Nationalist Government and it is only another irony of the authoritarian age that this anti-democratic body is now supporting the maintenance of the 'entrenched clauses' and objecting to interference with the existing constitution. Yet this should not be strange to South Africans. It was the Nationalist Party, when advocating a republic that would relegate the English-speaking 40 per cent. of the population to inferiority, which opposed bureaucratic attempts by the Smuts Government to destroy freedom of expression during the war. But now the Nationalist Party is in power and it is the United Party which is compelled to make an attempt to defend the democratic freedoms. Inexorably, the Nationalists are driven to excise individual rights and even where they adopt measures seemingly progressive in contradistinction to their predecessors, closer examination proves them to be in accord with the general tendency. Import control is a timely example. The protection of South African manufacture by this means in the present context contains more dangers than advantages. Not only does it tend to consolidate State power but it also results in a more austere standard of living and the Nationalist policy will undoubtedly aggravate the distortions of segregation and diminish further the home market. The basic tendency remains in full force—State monopolisation which engulfs the whole of society, white and black.

In South Africa already the beginnings exist of opposition to the omnipotent State. The varied support of movements in defence of civic liberties demonstrates how the totalitarian momentum liquidates old divisions and creates new identities of interest. True, there are also all too many attempts to evade the crucial issue that democracy is a principle which admits of no exceptions and which cannot be confined to one field and excluded from others. One of the outstanding examples of such compartmentalization has been indicated—the illusion among many Liberals that economic progress is possible without political. The common segregationist fantasy should be added—the adherence to political monstrosities that are economically quite untenable—the fancy that South Africa can continue to exist as two societies, one free, the other enslaved.

Finally, the tendency, noticeable among many progressives, of requiring pure motives is a hindrance. A progressive action does not lose its character

because it was inspired by the wrong reasons. A leaf can be taken out of the book of the United Party M.P., Col. R. D. Pilkington-Jordan who told a meeting at Rondebosch that he was prepared to co-operate with anybody, including the O.B., in fighting the Nationalist Government. 'I consider the threat to the constitution very seriously, and I repeat that I will use the co-operation of anybody to prevent the abolition of the political rights of the coloured and native communities of the Cape... This is a matter of the highest principle.' (*Die Transvaler*, January 15th, 1949). To the extent that any group or individual acts in a democratic direction and only to that extent, it is surely to be applauded and welcomed: the politics of motives can safely be left to those who are enamoured of witch-hunts.

It goes without saying that the non-European national movement will play a role of the utmost importance in the fight against State tyranny. Where the pressure is strongest and where it must become more grinding, there the most thorough and far-reaching conclusions and actions will discover a rich response. It was not for nothing that an African gathering once said that their programme was '*Sifuna zonke*'—'we want everything.'²³ Such a slogan becomes very apt for our times when everything is in danger of being lost. Without undervaluing the non-European movements of the past and present, it need only be remarked that their most obvious weakness has been a failure to break out of sporadic and limited activity. The non-European leaders, like other progressives, have tended in practice to ignore the underlying inter-connections of all democratic actions in South Africa and invariably the line has been one which led to the isolation of their movements from potential allies instead of towards them. This does not refer only to allies among the whites but among the non-European peoples themselves. The Zulu-Indian pogrom, naturally welcomed by the segregationist politicians, was one of the bitter fruits of this defect. Admirable as were actions like the Anti-C.A.D. movement of the Cape Coloured people which frustrated Smuts' attempt to set up a Coloured Affairs Department (on the lines of the Native Affairs Department) and to disfranchise them, it was, even in its later phases, far from achieving the non-European unity which was envisaged. And then it is still true that non-European emancipation is an insuperably difficult matter without the co-operation of whites who have had the opportunity to acquire the most advanced knowledge and training. It is evident that unless the fragmentary struggles, which will ensue under the most varied banners and often with self-contradictory aims (segregationist fights against bureaucracy for example), coalesce in the recognition that democracy cannot be divided and that it revenges itself upon those who attempt such division, South Africa faces only misery and ruin.

A persistent democratic movement in whatever connection cannot but find itself in concurrence with the emancipatory demands of the total population—for South Africa it is a truth of particular moment that the present struggles against Statification will never succeed if they remain solely within the boundaries of the white population. No group can safeguard or extend its freedoms alone.

March, 1949.

²³ S. P. Bunting: E. R. Roux (African Bookman, Cape Town).

A. N. WHITEHEAD: TWO VIEWS

I

Nathan Davidson

WHITEHEAD'S GOD

THE late Alfred North Whitehead, noted mathematician, symbolic logician, and philosophic interpreter of Relativity, founded the theory of Organism: his theory receives its most rigorous and fullest exposition in 'Process and Reality'.¹ This book has caused mental indigestion among his most scholarly sympathizers. Professor C. E. M. Joad in an introduction to a book on philosophy apologizes for not dealing with Whitehead because his metaphysical system proved unassimilable. Why, it has often been asked, have none of Whitehead's popularizers succeeded in coming to the rescue of a man like Joad? Such a sad state of affairs is quite reminiscent of a witticism which went the rounds after the publication of Stirling's 'The Secret of Hegel': 'If Mr. Sterling knew the secret of Hegel he had managed to keep it pretty well to himself'. Whitehead claimed never to have understood Hegel due to his obscurity; how picayune even Hegel appears in this respect alongside our modern Platonist.

I

Matter is generally referred to (by chemists and physicists) as an indefinable term, yet particular kinds of matter are defined by their specific properties. When one considers that matter has no material qualities but is a mental abstraction of all particular kinds of matter, one can fully understand the concept. What is important to bear in mind is that on one level of consideration, matter as such represents the abstract, and a particular kind of matter the concrete, but upon closer scrutiny the particular kind of matter itself is an abstraction as well as a generalization. Thinking consciously about the concrete and the abstract is the whole secret of a proper orientation towards speculative philosophy, which must be understood in order to comprehend and critically deal with Whitehead's God.

Whitehead's fundamental building blocks of nature are 'actual entities' or 'actual occasions'. These atomic elements are rudimentary organisms, which molecularly combine to form organisms of higher order. After slight treatment of the ramifications of his 'pulse beats of experience', as he metaphorically calls these occasions, he postulates a realm of entities, 'eternal objects', which transcends immediate occasions and ideally represents their qualities. Therefore the actual occasion is the particular, the concrete, the real; while eternal objects are the universal, the abstract, the ideal. Their nexus is 'ingression'. Ingression is the particular route eternal objects traverse in manifesting themselves in actual occasions, that is, the fashion in which the abstract concretizes itself. Ingression takes place through the mediation of God. For this investigation such a scheme of Whitehead's system will suffice.

It is interesting to contrast this Platonic rationalism in modern dress with empiricism's view as expressed by its high priest, John Dewey. After having

¹ A. N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, The Macmillan Co., Cambridge, 1930.

bent backwards to find every possible point of agreement with Whitehead, he states, in a chapter in 'The Problems of Men', in opposition to him that:

'The fact that the word 'ingression' is constantly used to designate their relation to actual entities suggests quite strongly the mathematical model. For ingression suggests an independent and ready-made subsistence of eternal objects, the latter being guaranteed by direct intuition. The conception of God in the total system seems to indicate that this is the proper interpretation, since some principle is certainly necessary, upon this premise, to act selectively in determining what eternal objects ingress in any given immediate occasion. The alternative view is that of the egression of natures, characters, or universals, as a consequence of the necessity of generalization from immediate occasions that exists in order to direct their further movement and its consequences. This capacity of intelligence performs the office for which Deity has to be invoked upon the other premise'.²

Aside from all considerations of the Deity, what is essentially counterposed is deduction against induction. Rationalism stresses 'ingression', while empiricism emphasizes 'egression'. Yet both Whitehead and Dewey recognize, incidentally, that induction and deduction cannot be separated. In the case of the physicist, the particular facts he accumulates are data shot through and through with interpretation. Whitehead would focus our physicist's problem upon unifying the particular factual items into a coherent scheme, which would permit a realization of missing parts, and would throw a beacon of light upon fruitful avenues of research; while Dewey would point out to him that additional facts impose a constant modification upon interpretation and theory. Even though they both recognize that the physicist employs these so-called different methods simultaneously, each emphasizes or gives primacy to his favoured approach. On closer examination the false division between induction and deduction that immediate inference yields collapses into a unity.³ Polemical zeal is not responsible for the one-sidedness which permeates their respective philosophies, but it is, to borrow a phrase from Whitehead, the Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness.

Dewey rightly assumes that in physical science mathematics plays a subsidiary rôle. Since mathematicians are neither interested in whether their axioms are congruent with reality or concerned whether the systems adduced from them are valid in the real world, nor whether they have utility at all, mathematics cannot properly be called a science. Yet Dewey is kind enough to give the appellation 'scientific' to mathematics. He is such a rigid empiricist, that after repeated insistence upon experimental verification he

² John Dewey, *Problems of Man*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1946, p. 416.

³ It is extremely interesting to see how Hegel handled this question in its original modern form. "Thus when Bacon set up induction in opposition to the syllogism," writes Hegel, "this opposition is formal; each induction is also a deduction, which fact was known even to Aristotle, for if a universal is deduced from a number of things, the first proposition reads, "These bodies have these qualities", the second, "All these bodies belong to one class": and thus, in the third place, this class has these qualities. That is a perfect syllogism. Induction always signifies that observations [have been] instituted, experiments made, experience derived."

G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Vol. III, trans. Haldane and Simson, 1898, p. 181.

can only leave his reader on philosophically barren ground because his cautiousness borders on timidity. Precisely because Whitehead utilizes the flexibility that the mathematical method affords, he is superior to Dewey. Even though the reader must discard most of what Whitehead has to say when he takes an intellectual voyage in one of his books like 'Science and the Modern World',⁴ his works nevertheless contain an abundance of provocative ideas, keen insights, and poignant problems. Today when to a fetishistic degree empiricism is granted universal recognition, it is imperative to say something in defence of speculative thinking. Mathematics best illustrates the utility of freeplay in the realm of thought. Non-Euclidean or Riemannian geometry and a branch of algebra, group theory, were developed in the 19th Century. Not until the 20th Century, however, did the question of their applicability arise in the Relativity theory and in Quantum physics. Whitehead fondly repeats that conic sections, with which the ancient Greek leisure class exercised their minds as a form of amusement, took eighteen hundred years to find an application in physical science.

Learning to think with rigorous logic, reasoning through universals, and resolving the perplexing enigma of methodology are the inviting fruits of speculative philosophy. This philosophy—which reached its zenith in Hegelian idealism—can teach science mastery of its subject matter as a result of its emphasis upon systematization. If the student of speculative philosophy can scrape off the caking of mysticism, which the person with a scientific mind usually finds so repugnant, he will discover that this discipline in conjunction with unadulterated empiricism (if such an animal really exists) can be most rewarding. The names associated with each great scientific landmark are noted more for synthetic grasp than for any illuminating discoveries. Outstanding instances are Newton's law of gravity, Darwin's evolutionary mechanism of natural selection, and Einstein's relativity theory.

II

As indicated by the title, this is not a critique of Whitehead's general philosophy nor of his metaphysics in particular, but is rather a criticism of his conception of God. Today, when scepticism is the rule (especially when one wants to put over something very old in modern form) subtlety and sophistication are expected. Yet when Whitehead strips his God of Judeo-Christian 'metaphysical complements', that is, the attributes traditionally allocated to a Supreme Being, we find a dilute, anaemic God, which is no more than glue to bind his philosophic system together. His major metaphysical problem is, why do eternal objects manifest themselves in particular actual entities, or, in non-Whiteheadian terminology, why do things, given the infinite range of possibilities, occur in the specific way in which they do? The Supreme Being that governs ingression is 'The Principle of Concretion', a God that is the 'ultimate limitation', and, in plain English, just Chance; all else that Whitehead attributes to his God is unworthy of attention. Whitehead quite frankly admits that his metaphysical problem is analogous to Aristotle's, and that he solved it in a manner similar to that of Aristotle two millenia ago. The basis for Whitehead's fallacious thinking rests upon his cursory dismissal of Aristotle's 'First Cause'—God—

⁴ A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1939.

because it was based on an antiquated physics. The first cause question can be handled logically or simply by a resort to rudimentary scientific postulates.

In the opening sections of Hegel's 'Science of Logic',⁵ his reasoning powers enable him to unravel the nonsensical, immediate common-sense idea of a first cause. He begins to cope with the problem by successfully finding a starting place for philosophy. He proceeds from the concept of Nothing. What is left of each object in the real world divested of all its determinations (colour, shape, size, etc.) is simply Nothing, or pure Being. Being or Pure Being is indeterminateness or vacuity; Nothing is complete emptiness without determination or content. Yet Being and Nothing cannot be the same, for in identity there must be some common determination, but this is self-contradictory by definition. Such abstractions as Being and Nothing, says Hegel, are empirically invalid. Here he shows his thought is saturated with insight and that he is not just fencing with words. Being and Nothing, Hegel goes on to explain, are a unity whose moments do not subsist for themselves, but only in transition, that is, Becoming. Then Hegel sums up in this fashion:

'What has been said throws light on the quality of the dialectic directed against the beginning of the world, as also against its destruction—the dialectic which was to establish the eternity of Matter and refute Becoming, arising, and passing away in general . . . This simple, ordinary dialectic is based on the retention of the opposition between Being and Nothing. The impossibility of a beginning of the world, or of anything, is demonstrated in the following manner:

Nothing can begin, either in so far as it is or in so far as it is not: for in so far as it is, it is not merely beginning; in so far as it is not, it is not even beginning. If the world, or anything, is supposed to have begun, it must have begun in Nothing; but Nothing is not Beginning, neither is there any beginning in it, for beginning comprehends a Being, and Nothing contains no Being. Nothing is only nothing. In a ground, cause, and so on (if Nothing is determined in that way), there is contained an affirmation, a Being. For the same reason something also ceases to be. For then Being would contain Nothing; but Being is only Being and not its own opposite.⁶

Thus the causal pattern does not travel in a straight line with a beginning and an end, but rather in a circle without either.

Late in the 18th century, a French chemist, Lavoisier, introduced the conservation of mass principle: the total amount of matter undergoing transformation from one form to another is constant. Today science retains this elementary and primary notion that matter can neither be created nor destroyed.⁷ (Helmholtz paraphrased a similar law of energy in 1847. Since matter can be dissolved into energy—as the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki demonstrated—and energy can be converted into matter,

⁵ G. W. F. Hegel, *Science of Logic*, trans. Johnson and Struthers, Allen and Unwin, London, 1929.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

⁷ The self-styled anti-materialist Whitehead was kind enough to say in *Science and the Modern World*, on p. 87: 'This was the last success of materialistic thought, which has not ultimately proved to be double-edged.'

a necessity seemingly arises for reformulating this law of matter's permanency. If we keep in mind the physical concept of Continuum, i.e. matter, energy and so called empty space are aspects of the same *thing*, then to substitute another term for matter to describe the all embracing stuff our universe is composed of is quite superfluous.) If matter is its own cause because it can neither be created nor destroyed, only the study of its transformations is meaningful. Eliminating the common-sense notion of beginnings and endings is the first real step towards obliterating all vestiges of reasoning with a religious tinge, something immediate thought cannot grasp.

Professor Sir James Jeans, noted mathematical physicist, and Professor Sir Arthur Eddington, renowned astronomer, both of whom represented a lunatic fringe among the literary popularizers of science, always reinforced their idealist writings by stressing mathematical probability. It is humorous that these men along with Whitehead and Dewey enter the same place of worship, and prostrate themselves before the goddess of Chance. Dewey owes this quirk to the hereditary connexion of pragmatism with the mathematical logician Charles Peirce. Jeans and Eddington buttress their philosophic position by leaning upon quantum physics. Present-day physicists, it is true, are far more interested in quantum theory than in relativity theory. Jeans and Eddington emphasized that quantum physics considers electrons as corpuscular packets which vibrate along certain paths: within certain bounds only statistics and mathematical probability explain why electrons traverse a particular route. With this our deep thinkers consequently employ a mathematical God, Chance. Planck, who is responsible for quantum physics, insisted upon interjecting a causal explanation before fetishizing statistics and probability. Statistics and probability are valuable in leading us towards theories and laws, and filling gaps in our knowledge of nature's mechanism, but to use our inability to account for phenomena by hypothesizing a God is juvenile. If we retain a causal explanation of nature while eliminating the first cause, and recognize that statistics can be but a useful instrument and probability a subsidiary factor,⁸ then the only flicker of an excuse for a God is extinguished.

III

Whitehead's conceptions are the last serious stumbling block in contemporary philosophy to the full acceptance of atheism, the actual scientific weltanschauung. In reality this last step must be surmounted, for if the concept of God is not purged from an individual's system he can easily slip back into the religio-mystical morass. Whitehead accelerates this regression by his 'objective' view of religion and science, which is that both

⁸ The qualification that probability or if you prefer chance's freeplay—which is not to be confused with spontaneity—does have a function to play, would superficially seem the Achilles' heel in the refutation of Whitehead's position. Specifically in the cause-effect patterns in nature necessity has its place as well as accident and each is determined by the other. Just as we have seen before that only through the proper integration of induction and deduction can we arrive at a scientific methodology, so does nature operate by an integration of necessity and accident in the harmonious play of causality. The overcoming of oneness in scientific methodology and in understanding causality, displays the validity of Hegel's famous dictum that, 'the truth is whole.'

camps are mutually in need of toleration. He illustrates this point most advantageously:

'Galileo said that the earth moves and the sun is fixed; the Inquisition said that the earth is fixed and the sun moves; and Newtonian astronomers, adopting an absolute theory of space, said that both the sun and the earth move. But now we may say that any one of these statements is equally true, provided that you have fixed the sense of 'rest' and 'motion' in the way required by the statement adopted. At the date of Galileo's controversy with the Inquisition, Galileo's way of stating the facts was, beyond question, the fruitful procedure for the sake of scientific research. But in itself it was not more true than the formulation of the Inquisition. But at that time the modern concept of relative motion was in nobody's mind; so that the statements were made in ignorance of the qualifications required for their more perfect truth. Yet this question of the motion of the earth and the sun expresses a real fact in the universe; and all sides had got hold of important truths concerning it. But with the knowledge of those times, the truths appeared inconsistent.'

It is a good thing to keep in mind that the intolerant party was the Catholic Church, and that Whitehead judges the validity of the contesting theories by scientific criteria; however, he sums up his position concerning the clash between religion and science by stating 'that there are wider truths and finer perspectives within which a reconciliation of a deeper religion and a more subtle science will be found'. Such a 'reconciliation' would be science's funeral; surely Galileo's name should suffice to conjure up an image of the nightmare that such a misalliance would be. One is left in a state of complete puzzlement to find a man with such erudition able to write, that 'the conflict between science and religion is a slight matter which has been unduly emphasized', because, 'Science is concerned with the general conditions which are observed to regulate physical phenomena; whereas religion is wholly wrapped up in the contemplation of moral and aesthetic values.' In the typically compromising manner of a college professor, Whitehead, not wishing to offend anyone, finds something good in almost anything. Instead of taking to task the reactionary role religion has played and is playing as an impediment to scientific progress, his words serve to pacify and obliterate the recognition of this.

II.

Edwin Blair

SCIENCE AND WHITEHEAD'S WORLD

IT is customary for Conservative scientists and liberal religious thinkers to conceive of a basic harmony between science and religion. It is averred that each has much to learn from the other, that their development should

* A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1939, p. 264; all other remaining quotations are also from chapter eleven, 'Religion and Science'.

be co-operative, that a synthesis is necessary and possible. Liberal scientists and conservative religionists take a more distant view of each other. If there is not outright hostility, there is at least coolness and the firm conviction that the other should confine itself to its own field. This article is concerned only with the theory of 'harmony'.

Most of the anti-fundamentalist ministers have publicly protested their friendship for science, and science in its turn has produced many Jeans's and Eddingtons. The well-known scientific journal, *Nature*, November 20th, 1948, contains an editorial entitled 'Material and Ethical Progress' which announces encouragingly: '... Lord Samuel's evening discourse on 'Science and Philosophy' called imperatively to science to join philosophy and religion in promoting a synthesis which would be adequate to redeem this age from past calamities and rescue it from present dangers.' The editorial goes on to mention Lord Lindsay's book, 'Religion, Science, and Society in the Modern World' and considers the fact that 'The "Present Question Conference" discussed the question "Is the present chaos caused by lack of scientific planning or by failure to recognize the reality of spirit?"'

The enormous influence of a much abler spokesman has recently been further extended. A. N. Whitehead's most popular book, 'Science and the Modern World', has appeared in a cheap edition. In it, the main emphasis is on a demonstration that science and religion require each other, and that their mutuality is one of the prime 'requisites for social progress'. Whitehead provides two main lines of argument to support his thesis: an historical description of the birth and growth of modern science, and an outline of his metaphysical system. Since this article is primarily concerned with the viewpoint of science, it is Whitehead's historical approach that is of central interest.

Whitehead looks for an evolutionary relationship between religion and science, but all he finds is the relationship of older brother and younger brother, not the relationship of parent and heir. He explains that in its origins science was not at all 'an appeal to reason. On the contrary, it was through and through an anti-intellectualist movement... based on a recoil from the inflexible rationality of mediæval thought'. He sees only 'a recoil' in the origins of science because he does not understand the origins of religion. Science arose within religion in much the same way that religion itself arose. Moreover, both show a roughly parallel development.

Almost every tribe seeks to explain, predict and control the variables in its environment by religious means. (Religious readers will perhaps prefer the term 'magic' or 'sympathetic magic'). They have all manner of gods, of rain, of death, of sickness, etc., in which the mechanism is anthropomorphic; for instance, the Happy Hunting Ground is obviously patterned after the worshippers' hunting grounds, nor do the tribesmen merely create gods, but they use them, e.g., to evoke rain.

The religious answers were among the earliest given to the problems that men stumbled over. Anthropomorphic religions explained the mysteries of the environment, not in the scientific sense, but by transforming fearful unknowns into man-like, or animal-like forms, in which process the strange was identified with the familiar—the essence of all explanation. Anthropomorphism introduced order and cause where there was little more than fear and chaos.

No wonder that religion was so widespread. Dozens of mythologies, folk-lore, and religions have been studied, and there is little doubt that anthropomorphic religion is a necessary stage of ideological development. Anthropomorphism is apparently the simplest type of theorizing; it is a level of imagination only a short step removed from practical observation. The 'make-believe' games of young children show a similar intermingling of the familiar animate and inanimate.

Only later were generalizations possible. The first explanations were subjected to scrutiny, and more sophisticated, general, and abstract answers evolved. The mythologies of Egypt, Greece, Rome, and Scandinavia have systems, families, and hierarchies of gods. There are gods of poetic inspiration as well as gods of the ocean, and there are considerations of the birth of gods, origin of the world, etc. The mediæval Churchmen carried still further the development of earlier explanations into a consistent body of doctrine.

But before answers could be studied as answers, problems had to be raised as problems. Primitive religion did not separate the two: a problem was accompanied or followed swiftly by an answer, though these answers became increasingly sophisticated. Later, catechisms were used. In providing a world-view, a primitive philosophy, religion perpetuated the consideration of the world from a general point of view. Religion represents a historical stage, a fore-runner, of the development of science.

Religions tended to incorporate, and dictate the framework of, early scientific discoveries. Whitehead points out at the beginning of his book:

In a generation which saw the Thirty Years' War and remembered Alva in the Netherlands, the worst that happened to men of science was that Galileo suffered an honourable detention and a mild reproof, before dying peacefully in his bed. The way in which the persecution of Galileo has been remembered is a tribute to the quiet commencement of the most intimate change in outlook which the human race had yet encountered. Since a babe was born in a manger, it may be doubted whether so great a thing has happened with so little stir.

Gradually religion lost its all-enveloping character. Philosophy, mathematics, science, etc., branched off. Specialization was enormously accelerated in the rise of modern civilization, but within the branches, there tended to be reproduced, in diminished form, the centuries of preceding development. Just as the human embryo recapitulates in its development the phylogenetic evolution of man, going through fish-like, monkey-like, etc., stages, so do ideological currents tend to reproduce in condensed form their phylogenetic past.

The early struggles of science against religion tended to be mild because what was at stake was yet in the future.¹ In ancient Greece and in mediæval China that future never arrived, so that science and religion never confronted each other as they have in the modern world. As the scope of European science widened, and that of religion narrowed, science had to face, in its own way, the same sort of problems with which the expanding religion of an earlier day was confronted. It is not surprising, then, to find that often the scientists tackled problems in a manner similar to that of

¹ The early scientists, e.g. Newton and Pascal, wrote religious articles as well as scientific papers.

their predecessors. The terminology was different, and the significance of the step was different: the reproduction of stages was partial, incomplete, telescoped, and temporary.

In its formative period, modern physics, for example, showed a certain inability to live with important, unanswered questions. Phenomena had to be given explanatory names, just as (on a much lower level) rain had to be ascribed to Rain Gods. Burning (combustion) was due to phlogiston; gravity was due to a special fluid; heat was due to caloric; light was due to corpuscles; electricity was due to electric fluids. (There were long discussions on whether positive and negative electric charges indicated two fluids, or one fluid and its absence). Even today, there are still to be heard the echoes of the disputes over the existence of a completely hypothetical ether, which has never been detected and whose *ad hoc* properties have almost disappeared.

In this, physics was not alone. Though it is true that biologists no longer insist on the existence of a vital life-fluid, and their counterpart, in the form of the simple materialist mechanists, are no longer taken seriously, the newer sciences, especially psychology and sociology, are still shot through with meaningless terminology. The Freudian ego, id, super-ego, Oedipus and other complexes, etc., are under attack by whole schools of ex-Freudians, and even some Freudians are finding it possible to describe, and sometimes to analyze and explain, patterns of neurotic behaviour without leaning as heavily as formerly on the Words-which-name-our-ignorance. But as with the tribesmen, the Words do more than give a name to ignorance; they become obstacles to overcoming ignorance, and signify a halt in the search, a stage of development which must be re-energized before a higher stage can be reached.

The reproduction, in condensed form, of past stages of development can be discerned not only within each science, but within the development of science as a whole. Religion progressed from gods of environment to gods involved in human behaviour, from rain gods with man-like souls to men with god-like souls. Science, too, has progressed from the physical sciences to the sciences of man. In the early days of physical science, the Church and 'human nature' (another Word) sufficed for man, while planetary motions and chemical reactions were the most fit subjects for man's mind. The gradual extension of the scientific outlook has approximated more and more closely to the outlooker. And correspondingly, the newer sciences have presented material which has influenced the older sciences. Even philosophy has been influenced, and among the philosophers, Whitehead.

Modern science has broken the bonds that held question and answer inseparable. With the ability to ask questions and then look for answers, science has come of age. The ancient Greeks reached this level; so did the great theologians of the Middle Ages; but the Greeks seldom (in such men as Archimedes, and in some of the works of Aristotle) raised their questions in the framework of the everyday world, and the theologians restricted their ponderings even more severely. It is not accurate to say, as has often been the case, that the use of empirical experiments set science free. Experiments were only one aspect of a mode of thought that regarded *all* subjects as open to its treatment. Experiments were a consequence (and a cause) of attempts to make reasonable the ordinary events that had been taken for

granted. Only when theory became interested in all practice could the general idea take hold: the unity of theory and practice.

Whitehead begins his book with a sketch of the origins of science. At the end of the book he emerges with God. Despite many historical references neatly tied into hundred-year bundles, historical insight is lacking. The above paragraphs are no more than a thumbnail sketch, but they show the direction which Whitehead has avoided.

Whitehead is a religious philosopher. He has 'gone about as far as he can go' and still be religious. He sees through many an empty Word and calls it 'the fallacy of misplaced concreteness'. Whitehead sees his task as that of applying scientific methods, specifically those of mathematics, to a philosophy which shall, in addition, embrace religion. Whitehead's conception of religious experience, therefore, consists of the modern psychologists' awareness of self grafted on to older ideas:

Religion is the vision of something which stands beyond, behind, and within the passing flux of immediate things... something that gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension. . . . What we want is to draw out habits of aesthetic apprehension . . . to do so is to increase the depths of individuality. . . . We must foster the creative initiative towards the maintenance of objective values. . . . Sensitiveness without impulse spells decadence. . . .

Unfortunately, Whitehead has only been influenced, not converted by modern science, or, rather, not unconverted from religion. The older phylogeny betrays itself. Whitehead's church is fully equipped with private words, e.g. 'primate', 'ingression', 'modes', 'organism', and highest of all 'eternal objects'. The litany chants are there too, but since we are in a 'rational' church, it is sung with mathematics:

In the lowest grade of eternal objects are to be placed those objects whose individual essences are simple. This is the grade of zero complexity. Next consider any set of such objects, finite or infinite as to the number of its members. For example, consider the set of three eternal objects A, B, C, of which none is complex. Let us write $R(A,B,C)$ for some definite possible relatedness of A,B,C. To take a simple example, A,B,C may be three definite colours with the spatio-temporal relatedness to each other of three faces of a regular tetrahedron, anywhere at any time. Then $R(A,B,C)$ is another eternal object of the lowest complex grade. Analogously there are eternal objects of successively higher grades. In respect to any complex eternal object, $S(D_1, D_2, \dots D_n)$, the eternal objects $D_1, \dots D_n$, whose individual essences are constitutive of the individual essence of $S(D_1, \dots D_n)$, are called the components of $S(D_1, \dots D_n)$

And so on, for many pages.

But sooner or later the preacher must emerge with something his congregation can take home:

God is the ultimate limitation, and His existence is the ultimate irrationality. For no reason can be given for just that limitation which stands in His nature to impose. . . . No reason can be given for the nature of God, because that nature is the ground of rationality. . . .

It can be seen that Whitehead has completely reversed the position of his first chapter, in which young science protested its right to learn what it did not know against religion which knew everything. For example, 'Galileo keeps harping on how things happen, whereas his adversaries had a complete theory as to why things happen. . . Galileo insists on "irreducible and stubborn facts", and Simplicius, his opponent, brings forward reasons, completely satisfactory, at least to himself'. In the last chapter, it is now Whitehead who can reason out a rounded theory of eternal objects. In the first chapter, Whitehead says of mediæval civilization: 'There was nothing vague. It was not a question of admirable maxims, but of definite procedure to put things right and keep them there'. But in the last chapter: 'The anti-rationalism of science is partly justified, as a preservation of its useful methodology; it is partly mere irrational prejudice'.

Whitehead shows in several passages that by 'anti-rationalism' he is accusing science, not only of a contempt for metaphysics, but of a vulgar materialism which can be justly maintained only against science in an earlier period. Modern science does not restrict itself to tangibles; the partial merging of modern physics and higher mathematics is clear enough evidence of the 'rationalism' and abstractionism of science.

More than self-contradiction is involved. The whole history of how scientific methods have been able progressively to raise the level of our understanding is misconstrued. Whitehead cites several examples of whole fields of knowledge from which science has driven religion: the Church theory of the solar system, the Biblical age of the earth versus the geological, the doctrine of organic evolution. He goes on to add that within science itself theories have risen and been discarded. But three important implications are lost on him.

First, all the battles have gone one way.² Generally, when one side uninterruptedly wins every test of strength, it is reasonable to consider at least the possibility of a final and complete victory. A mathematician, in particular, should think of arranging the events in a series and investigating whether the series has a finite limit.

Second, science has generally emerged strengthened by outgrowing one of its theories, whereas theology has emerged weakened after collisions with science, and internal conflicts.

Third, the reason for this is that science functions in such a way as to discard and replace its theories; theology functions through the vain attempt to buttress and support its theories. That is, science constantly casts doubts upon its own findings and hypotheses; theology, on the other hand, burned doubters at the stake, and entitled St. Thomas Aquinas' five-foot shelf, 'Summa Theologica'. There is no comparable 'Summa Scientifica'. The consistent scientist is the eternal protestant; the supporters of religion are eternally concerned with justifying the ways of their god to man.

The struggle between science and religion has been the struggle for the right to say, 'I don't know'. Religious people have always been sure there is a God, a Heaven, a soul, eternal objects. Whitehead is sophisticated; he

²Whitehead says, '...normally an advance in science will show that statements of various religious beliefs require some sort of modification'. From this he concludes: 'Insofar, therefore, as any religion has any contact with physical facts... the point of view of those facts must be continually modified...' (my emphasis).

has dropped the Heaven and the soul, but he has not dared to say, 'I don't know.' Science has many, many 'I don't know's', but the Whiteheads and the Eddingtons and the Jeans's have drawn knowing conclusions anyway. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle, which states only that there is a theoretical limit to the accuracy of some types of measurements, has led such men to deduce from it, free will. The mechanism of radioactive disintegration is not understood, and is *analyzed* in probability terms. (In a similar manner, the mortality tables of the life insurance companies reflect not who will die in a given year, but approximately how many). For Whitehead scientific problems become arguments for a God: 'Some particular *how* is necessary, and some particularization in the *what* of matter of fact is necessary. The only alternative to this admission, is to deny the reality of actual occasions... God is not concrete, but He is the ground for concrete actuality'.

Religion in modern times has remained an escape, a refuge, an 'opium of the people', a 'quest for certainty'. Whitehead feels there *must* be 'ground for concrete actuality'; a how is '*necessary*'. Religion has stood still while science has gone ahead. In the tribes who inhabit the more 'advanced' countries of the world there is sore need for a faith in something better, but Whitehead points backward, not forward. Modern mathematics is often concerned with existence theorems; for Whitehead the existence of answers must be guaranteed in advance.

Whitehead's final argument for his God is interesting: 'We should wait: but we would not wait passively, or in despair.' (That is, everyone should keep on going to church—EB). The clash is a sign that there are wider truths and finer perspectives within which a reconciliation of a deeper religion and a more subtle science will be found... A mere logical contradiction cannot in itself point to more than the necessity of some readjustments, possibly of a very minor character on both sides'. A few pages farther on he says, 'In formal logic, a contradiction is the signal of a defeat: but in the evolution of real knowledge it marks the first step in progress toward a victory'. But Whitehead cannot present any real, worthwhile knowledge that has been discovered by religious methods. Moreover, it is in Whitehead's logical religion that 'formal logic' reigns; it is in scientific thought that contradictions lead to conclusions on a higher level. And even then, not every contradiction; sometimes contradictions lead to de-composition. Whitehead does not heed his own distinction between contradictions which signal defeat and contradictions which signal progress. He is reduced to defending his religious conceptions with an argument that applies universally: *no* issue is ever settled, because there is always tomorrow. True—and false.

There is a still more serious side of Whitehead's argument that we should remain 'open-minded' about the conflict between religion and science. What would Whitehead be able to say, or do, against the anti-Semites who justify their activities with: 'We have a democratic right to hate whom we choose?' The 'open-mind' (for example, T. S. Eliot's similar plea for—totalitarianism) presents itself as being open at both ends, and reveals itself as being closed at both ends.

³ But Whitehead does not stick to his own dictum of withholding judgement: '... religion collapses unless its main positions command immediacy of assent'.

The acceptance of tenets must be based on the tenets, not on metaphysical revolving doors. Whitehead had need of his own closing paragraphs: 'They refused to face the necessities for social reform imposed by the new industrial system, and they are now refusing to face the necessities for intellectual reform imposed by the new knowledge'.

The history of the 'new knowledge' indicates that to speak of religion as the handmaiden of science *today* means to misunderstand both the history of science and of religion. The great studies of the history of science still lie in the future. Throughout the two or three hundred years of modern science there have been cases of important discoveries or inventions being made by several scientists working independently and almost simultaneously; yet even obvious clues like these have not been exploited. Why did geology, which is a physical science, develop so late? Why do certain countries assume the leadership in certain fields for certain periods? How much of mathematics or physics could have been expected to be worked out in the order in which it was, due to the internal logical structure of the subject? These, and hundreds of other similar questions have not yet been studied seriously. They will be taken seriously if science is permitted to radiate into the study of history. Those who will push science forward in such directions will be freer than ever of the vestiges of religion.

April 5th, 1949.

A Roof Over One's Dead

Washington, March 13.—The Secretary of Defence, Mr. Forrestal, last night issued a statement to correct widespread misunderstanding of the potentialities of biological warfare.

... Many articles had described biological warfare as more terrible than the atomic bomb. The fact was that the two weapons differed so basically that it made direct comparison meaningless. The atomic bomb destroyed not only life but buildings and other physical structures, and also there was atomic radiation in contaminated areas. Biological warfare agents affected only living matter and generally were non-persistent.

The Times.

Harry Marlowe

THE TUCKER CAR AND THE AMERICAN AUTO INDUSTRY

NEARLY every American takes as a natural article of faith that American industry has been for some time, and certainly will remain the best in the world. He is convinced that it has proved its superiority both in quantity and quality of production in competition with the whole world; and that the best, most obvious, example of both quality and quantity is the American automobile. It is hardly possible to separate the very thought of American industry in general from this automobile, conspicuous as it is in the daily life of everyone in America, and in the life of other countries as well.

In fact, its history is deeply embedded in the knowledge, experience, and affections of Americans as is hardly anything else. It has even been alleged that very many Americans get a greater intensity of pleasure in driving automobiles than in sexual love; so it has been alleged. Anyway, there are whole generations who bring to mind with real sentiment many old sweet-sounding names: the Thomas which won the round-the-world race, the Cadillacs which during World War I introduced into Europe (at least so legend has it) the system of standard, interchangeable parts; Pierce-Arrow, Packard, Franklin, Stanley, Star, Model T and Model A.

This auto made its way not only in America but in the areas of international competition as well and compelled respect. What was the reason for this success? For a start, the answer which any engineer in the auto field can give us in hard and immediate terms will meet our present purpose. 'We *should* know how to build them, we have made several times more than the rest of the world put together'.

Just because of the immense possibilities for production in such quantity, the vast actual and potential market, the industry in its advance has relied to a greater extent than that of any other country on a process of trial-and-error on a huge scale. The process is the well-known 'free competition' among 'rugged individualists'.

Such 'individualists', characteristically engineers and production men previously employed by the existing companies, have started out independently, gained a foothold in 'free competition', and initiated in doing so a surprisingly great number of the industry's important forward steps. We need only call to mind Henry Ford, who set in motion modern mass-production for the whole industry, or Chrysler who launched his company in 1924 and broke the prevailing dullness by being the first to employ the high-compression engine and hydraulic brakes which have since come into general use.

But for the present day, it is revealing that the word 'independent' used in the industry to describe such manufacturers, has come to mean a tremendous corporation which may own its own steel mills, mines, plate-glass works, tyre-factories, even railroads, and which could, by itself,

probably match the total production of all France or Italy. Yet it bears this designation, which, as it were, makes it the struggling little brother of the real masters of the field. Until the great depression, and even for a time afterwards, a considerable number of auto-builders were relatively small companies. Only as the upshot of the ten years from 1929 to 1939 did the industry narrow down to the top three (General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler) and after them a few large and favourably situated 'independents'. For the last year mentioned there appears on the list: Studebaker, Packard, Hudson, Willys-Overland, Nash, Graham-Paige. With these few names the whole of American auto production is virtually exhausted.

It was by no means the rule that cars mechanically inferior went out of business. On the contrary, many makes possessed features in some respects superior to those of surviving ones. Among the autos which went out of the market from 1929 to 1939 was Reo, as durable and well-made a car as any of its rivals, and better than the majority; Stutz, a high-powered car with exceptional characteristics; Peerless; Franklin, whose air-cooled engine was in numerous ways better than conventional water-cooled ones; Pierce-Arrow, an old name in the industry and the quality of whose product was unquestioned; Cord, which anticipated many of the most modern features of design.

The striking thing is this. Contemporaneous with the extinction of the last of this class of small independents, we see the introduction of *the last important improvements which American autos have undergone*. With the general use of high-compression engines, hydraulic brakes, and synchro-mesh transmissions, mechanical development in major respects came to a virtual standstill. All improvements since then, the mid-1930's, barring certain changes in transmission and suspension, not all of which were good or enduring, have been in the nature of refinements and alterations of details, 'comfort', 'style', horsepower, and overall size. Furthermore, increases of prices accompanied these 'improvements'.

The always increasing concentration of industry is of course something which is not confined to America, or to the auto industry. Yet it is our contention, corroborated by the whole range of facts, that its operation here has damaged the American auto industry most. In removing the competing 'independents' it has stifled just its own characteristic mode of advance in basic design. The successes of American industry have been due notably to the operation of unhindered 'free enterprise'. However, the corollary is this. As free-enterprise is choked off, in the auto industry more than anywhere are the ill-consequences to be observed.

With the end of the war and the resumption of auto-production, though a demand has accumulated which would support even the weakest of producers, the great companies have inherited the whole market for themselves. These companies have proved incapable, or unwilling either to relieve adequately the absolute shortage of autos or to advance designs basically even a tiny fraction as against 1941. Further, they admit publicly that they will do neither for at least two years, as in the recent statement by S. E. Skinner, vice-president of General Motors.

The worse it becomes, however, the more insistent the tone of the immense mass of publicity and advertising at all levels and in all media, put out by the same great companies, which asserts exactly the opposite. In *this*

branch of mass production, America has something of which she can be truly proud, in a way. The companies have had to perpetuate the tradition, which has become a sort of national myth, of yearly 'revolutionary changes' in auto models ever since 1935 or thereabouts, when the exaggeration still remained within the healthy limits of approximately 300 per cent. of the truth.

And now, at last, when it becomes really impossible to maintain the fiction any longer, there comes into prominence a new point of view, which tries to 'justify' the real state of affairs and unload the responsibility for it. We wish to examine this point of view in a recent example. We refer to an article by Howard Whitman in *Collier's* magazine of November, 1948, entitled 'The Shape of Cars to Come'. It begins:

'The man in the pearl-grey shirt, standing by a window that framed a thousand rooftops of Detroit, was one of the little-known but vastly misunderstood clique of men called car-designers. "You think I decide what cars are going to look like?" he asked. "Don't you believe it. The people of America, God bless them, design the cars. I just dance to their music'.

'... We'd build cars with pinwheels on them... We'd make them go sideways. We'd even make a car that would sit up and beg—if the public wanted it that way'.

Whitman goes on at some length about the huge 'marketing research' departments which the great companies employ in studying the smallest oscillations in the response of buyers to dark-grey as against light-grey paint jobs, the number of square inches of chromium trim preferred, the colour of the plastic knobs on the dashboard, etc. All this, he judges, indicates the degree to which the auto designer is the servant of public taste, bringing the consumer all that he asks for, 'no faster, no slower' than he does ask for it.

As justification for the fact that we do not *really* see great leaps in design from year to year, Whitman points to the Chrysler 'Airflow' of 1934. This car possessed, as he quite correctly points out, virtually all the features available in present models, but was nonetheless a failure from the standpoint of sales. For him this indicates that the public will not accept 'revolutionary changes' in design all at once. The auto-builders, for reasons of business prudence, are obliged to dole out changes to this public in small portions, watching all the while the slow advance of its 'taste' through the opinion-poll surveys.

Now the case of the Chrysler 'Airflow' is in fact very telling, but the moral is not the one Whitman adduces. The 'Airflow', mechanically a good car on the whole, 15 years ago offered in body design something resembling the now-prevailing bulbous, ultra-streamlined 'torpedo' style, an overdrive transmission, and *not much else*. And that is precisely the case with autos in general since 1934. The point is not that the 'Airflow' was rejected because it was too revolutionary, but rather that the allegations of 'revolutionary changes' in autos are mere embroidery, to say it politely, even if we compare *then* and *now* directly, let alone year-to-year comparisons.

Adjoining Whitman's article is a good example of the 'survey' which for him is the essential link between auto-designer and public. It tells the whole story. It is called the 'Collier's Auto Design Quiz'. The reader and potential buyer is asked (1) Which style of body-design do you prefer, and is given

the choice, 'high and square', 'streamlined', 'wide-view' (exceptionally large windows), and 'futuristic'; (2) What model; (3) How much trim; (4) What kind of upholstery; (5) What accessories; and (6) What special features in terms of overdrive, automatic transmission, air-conditioning (!), high-compression engine all at *extra cost*.

Here the main point at issue becomes visible. In basic body design, the buyer has the 'choice' only among variations found in existing cars with the exception of 'futuristic' or teardrop design, streamlining carried to the limit, which the auto men are pretty sure people do not want in any case. The *main* objections which drivers have been expressing recently against existing bodies: their excessive size, artificial streamlining and 'styling', and the excessive vulnerability to traffic-friction of the now-prevalent balloon-doors and built-in fenders, are not even mentioned.¹

In basic mechanical design, correspondingly, the buyer is given a 'choice' only in 'special features' bearing an extra cost, and here again his choice is restricted to features found in existing cars and of limited importance. Concerning the major thing which is on the horizon in auto design, engine in the rear, the quiz maintains a graceful, untroubled, studiously profound silence.

The consumers who had bought independent makes for the sake of some special feature of design (the autos in the independent class were often in the high-cost brackets) felt a pinch in the pocket-book which obliged them to turn to cheaper popular makes. The consideration of cost in manufacture came to the fore and dominated as never before. The cost-margin grew always narrower for basic innovation in the great names which dominated the field. The tradition of competition which leads the advertisers to claim against each other that they have put something 'absolutely new' into the current models established itself increasingly on the base of the least costly changes, those of 'style', accessories, etc.

Understandably, the choice of the auto-consumer is driven forcefully in the direction of the cheaper product. Yet when the upshot, the sum and average of his choices finally appears, salvation is very far from gained. The cost of autos to the consumer begins to rise again, *but not on the basis*

¹ That these *are* the sources of complaint, and that public reaction has given very firm evidence of the rebellion of the consumers, is supported by a great deal of evidence, some of which we may cite. An item in the *New York Times* of December 2nd, 1948, lists complaints received by the New York Automobile Club: 'post-war hoods are too long, thereby reducing road vision, and that increased width and length prevented storage in the average garage. Particular stress was given to the built-in fenders of post-war vehicles as increasing repair-bills when damaged'. And as for the practical implementation of the complaint, another item of December 22nd: 'The small cars built in England are gaining in popularity here because they are easily manoeuvred in traffic and limited parking spaces, and also because of gasoline economy... British manufacturers expect to sell 40,000 motor units in the U.S. in 1949'. An item of January 29th, 1949: 'Britain exported 24,475 automobiles to the United States last year, compared with only 45 in 1938'. The same consumer reaction is in evidence in the great popularity of the cars put out by Willys-Overland, whose body design is based on the small, angular, *quite unstreamlined* 'jeep' originally built for military purposes. In the same direction, an item of January 15th: 'Restrictions imposed on motoring by traffic, parking, and garaging were recognized in the remedies offered today in the 1949 cars presented by the Chrysler corporation... One to four inches have been pared from the vehicles, as compared with previous designs'.

of improvements in fundamental design. The advertisers had pretended in the past that a few changes in the sheet metal as against the previous year, constituted world-shaking innovations. Now this swindle begins to grow real teeth. The great companies, continuing to follow the now-established policy of making 'stylistic' (i.e., the cheapest possible) changes from year to year, are now in a position to *charge* for these changes. Autos become everlastingly larger, each increase in size or horsepower calling for a bigger price; accessories, many at an extra cost, develop to an absurd degree; 'streamlining' becomes a vice.

And now, just now, comes someone like Whitman and declares that the taste which has been cultivated in the consumer under conditions in which he had no alternative but to choose one frivolous alteration against its absence, or against some other, is nothing less than Public Taste, a sort of massive not-readily-alterable independent substance, which is to be examined minutely in surveys and polls, and bowed to reverently by the designers. The way in which this illusion of 'public taste' is imposed is simply this: the existing field of choice is represented as the 'normal' and only possible one. But this conclusion cannot be maintained short of accepting the premise that the consumer is an idiot. Belief in that premise is the only thing which could support, e.g., the recent allegation by Kettering, of General Motors, that the consumer does not really care whether the engine is in the front or the rear. i.e., does not care whether he gets better economy, performance, etc., out of a car or not, and is concerned only with two-tone paint jobs, swept-back fenders, and so on. But the best proof of that is the fact that just those who talk the most about public taste in artificialities, display a marvellous anxiety not to put the matter to an actual test.

It is characteristic of our society that in everything it tends to lose sight of the originally and immediately evident relation between a product and its use. The traits which an automobile requires to fulfill more satisfactorily the needs of its actual use are universal and nearly self-evident and for that reason precisely they can be 'ignored' and dropped from sight. They are traits of improved performance, economy, and mechanical quality. Whereas in the field of body-design, where a little latitude of choice exists in certain sectors, the consumers have clearly demonstrated that they react quickly in a way which contains more rationality than all the automobile publicity that was ever printed. Similarly, in the basic mechanical realm, *once offer the consumer a real alternative* and you will see the dominance of the taste for 'swept-back' fenders and so on melt away like the morning mists.

II

Though the independents had been largely eliminated, the outcome of the war gave a new chance, within limited sectors, for their re-birth. The industrial organism (resembling in this respect all organisms) reacts to great stress by dropping back to an earlier stage in its own development. The sudden and huge need for war-goods had produced all sorts of sub-contractors and mushroom-companies. Even those occupying weak and anomalous positions can thrive under conditions of cost-plus. But when the war ended, this return to an earlier level in industrial concentration could not be simply 'retracted'. A chance is opened to 'upstarts' through the by-products of industrial and technical development in the interim. War-time

earnings, government-built plants of the most modern design, patents and technical innovations purchasable or in the public domain now exist. The use of these by products has in fact been responsible for the spots of lesser gloom which do exist in the overall dark picture in auto: the Kaiser-Frazer enterprise, and the exceptional expansion of Willys-Overland on the basis of the military 'jeep'. The Tucker corporation, we shall see, has proposed to make a more thorough and extensive use of these new possibilities than have any of the others.

In 1946 full-page advertisements appeared in major papers of an auto of authentically new and radical design, the Tucker, to be built by a new and 'independent' company and offered to the public at the price of a medium-sized car. An article by Ken Purdy in the January, 1949, *True* magazine (Fawcett Publications, Greenwich, Conn.) contains the main facts concerning the design of the Tucker car and the history of the company. Much is due to Purdy for his sympathetic and thorough treatment.

The Tucker, as described in the advertisement, possesses an opposed-cylinder engine located in the rear, readily removable together with transmission (separate differential eliminated) in a 'package', automatic torque-converter or pre-selector transmission, fuel injection, rubber-torsion suspension independent on all four wheels, airplane type disc brakes, and safety provisions for the front seat which include rubber-padded dashboard with projections eliminated, a crash-chamber beneath it as has been used in racing cars, and a windshield which flies out in one piece upon sharp impact. The rubber-padded dashboard has been adopted by Chrysler for one of his more expensive models.

It can be stated with certainty that everyone in America with a little knowledge of autos, and the number is enormous, read Tucker's advertisements with envy. It was abundantly clear that if the claims in these advertisements were justified, the Tucker would be incomparably better than *any* car on the American market. People waited eagerly for the Tucker to appear, and they are still waiting. This is a long and grievous story, to be examined, relying quite largely on Purdy, who has obtained pertinent material direct from Tucker and his associates.

Over the two years intervening, the papers have administered an antidote to their readers' hopes, nicely calculated to turn these hopes to scepticism. They have carried periodic reports of Tucker's difficulties in bringing his auto into production, and a series of items on a great number of suits, investigations, and claims of various kinds. Prominent in these items has always been allegations tending to minimize the mechanical excellence of the car, the technical competence of the company to produce, and the personal character of Tucker and his associates.

The thing, then, which must be made clear beyond possibility of doubt, which cannot be given too much emphasis, is that, so far as reliable evidence is available, *these allegations are in every important particular false.*

First, as to the mechanical features of the car. The main concern is of course the engine. That employed by Tucker is of a design similar to that of the Franklin aircraft engine, well-known to be one of the best of its kind in aircraft service. It has six cylinders, arranged in two opposed banks of three. For testimony as to the quality of its design and construction, we

need go no farther than the praise given it in the publication of the Society of Automotive Engineers. The automatic torque-converter transmission is similar to that available in the Buick, and is regarded as the best of the fluid transmissions so far built. The two features, airplane type disc brakes and fuel-injection, have both proved superiority in aircraft service. This is unfortunate for the standard argument of those who lag behind in design that the new feature offered by their opponent is 'untried', 'incompletely developed'. The subsequent financial difficulties of the Tucker company have forced them to lay aside these features by reason of the extra expense involved, but only for the first cars to be produced.

It must be pointed out that the merit of the remaining features is self-evident even to those who are not technically trained, just so long as it is certain that the car actually exists and does embody these features. For that reason precisely, many of the items of news have sought to imply that no finished cars have actually been produced. However, a small number of cars is in existence, used largely for test purposes. The most important feature is the location of the engine in the rear with its saving in weight by elimination of the drive shaft and its great increase in efficiency in the transmission of power to the wheels.

An additional merit of the Tucker design, even against other rear-engine designs, is the compactness of all the main moving parts which the common location of engine, transmission, and differential affords. This has been utilized to make of these parts a 'package' which can be taken out by a mechanic in thirty minutes.

This most desirable advance shows up vividly against the background of 'stylistic' development in autos in the past fifteen years. Autos have steadily gained longer and higher fenders, which cut off more and more of the engine-hood. The hood of cars up to 1933 was a hinged sheet of metal covering the engine, which, when removed, made it accessible on the top and most of both sides. Modern fenders cut off the access to the sides entirely, and the hood has degenerated into a mere lid, which when opened exposes the engine on the top only, located in a kind of pit. If a mechanic is obliged to do heavy work on it with wrench or hammer, he will be lucky to get away for long without damaged knuckles. By providing for the removal of the whole engine-transmission unit, that is, all of the important moving parts of the automobile except the wheels and steering gears so that it can be checked or repaired on a bench, the Tucker design wholly solves this problem of access. It has further possibilities which could be much developed. An obvious application is that Tucker servicing dealers can keep in stock complete units for temporary replacement of engines when the latter need serious overhaul or servicing; thus the car need never be tied up in the garage longer than the time required to switch the unit.

Between these facts and the content of items appearing in the press, there is a curious, glaring contrast. One such item will do very well to give the overall impression they make on the reader. For it carries everything to a slightly higher pitch, and thus defines the general quality of this 'information'. It is a complaint filed in a Chicago court (reported in the *New York Times* of October 14th, 1948) by two New York Tucker dealers and two stockholders, asking that the company be taken into receivership.

It alleges that Tucker's first car was actually a rebuilt 1942 Oldsmobile,

that the engine publicized by Tucker existed only as a promise, not even in blueprint, that to date the company has not been able to produce a marketable rear-engine, that 'to the knowledge of the defendants rear-engines have been used and abandoned as impracticable'. It adds several other things about Tucker's personal character, asserting that he is not an engineer or designer, and that he has misused company funds in various ways.

The best thing we can say about these charges is that we cannot be certain from generally available information that all of them without exception are totally false. But we can come so near this mark that it tempts us, like a hilltop a few steps ahead when the main climb has been accomplished. As to the assertion that 'rear drive engines have been used and abandoned as impractical', we may paraphrase Purdy in saying that if we skip over the Czech Tatra, the Isotta-Fraschini, the Mercedes, the post-war Renault and, we may add, the new German *Volkswagen*, this statement may pass as justified. Or, take the further assertion 'Tucker has been unable to produce a marketable rear-drive engine'. This may be judged by setting it opposite the opinion on the subject of the *Automotive Digest*, for September, 1948, a publication of the S.A.E., which appeared the month previous to the filing of the complaint; 'Throughout the engine, simplicity and interchangeability have been kept in mind, resulting in an engine which is very powerful, economical, and long-lived. It is at least as accessible as any of the current installations and far more easy to get at than a lot of them. Every indication is that the power plant... will be successful, to say the least, if not outstanding'. The assertion that the first Tucker was a rebuilt Oldsmobile is false. Prior to production it existed only as a clay model. The charges imply that the car and engine do not actually exist in complete form. Purdy describes a ride in one of them with satisfaction.

The author of this complaint exhibits talent. He will rise, that is sure. It is unlikely that abilities of this kind will not find a market. We will go further, in fact, and point out that there is a great future for him in auto-advertising.

This item is only one of many. To understand their source, we must trace briefly the history of the company. In September of 1946, Tucker, as high-bidder, leased from the War Assets Administration a part of the great Chicago factory built during the war to make B-29 aircraft engines. It cost \$170,000,000 to build and contained \$120,000,000 worth of machine tools, covers 93 acres, possesses its own power house, foundries, machine shops and forging shops.

In October, a cancellation of the lease was sought in favour of the Lustron Co. which proposed to build pre-fabricated houses in it. The cancellation did not go through. This is the only case (and a very revealing one) Tucker declares, in which the government agencies did not unite in a stand against him. By grace of this combination of circumstances his company was actually launched. He was finally enabled to buy the plant outright in 1947.

With his plant secured, he offered stock through the Chicago underwriter Floyd Cerf, 4,000,000 shares at \$5 a share, of which 3,333,333 were sold. This was in the spring of 1947, and was subject, by Tucker's report, to an extraordinary delay in the routine investigation on the part of the Securities Exchange Commission. The work to fit out the plant for auto production then got under way.

On October 19th, Senator Ferguson from Michigan (and not merely from

Michigan, but also from Detroit) declared his intention to investigate an 'anonymous telegram' revealing that four former W.A.A. employees were working for Tucker. 'It now goes back to the question of how Preston Tucker, the corporation's president, got his option on the Chicago plant'. Tucker was high-bidder for the plant, the burden of proof of any irregularity thus lies on the maker of the charge. Tucker declared that he would be glad to co-operate with any investigation. *The charge was not pressed further.* Among private citizens, damaging charges containing direct implication of illegal practice, which are promulgated and then *not proved*, would be called slander, and would condemn not the victim, but the slanderer. A year later the columnist Drew Pearson brought plain evidence of Ferguson's connection with the Chrysler corporation. Let us hope that Ferguson, for awkwardness in his use of the talents so richly supplied by nature to all Congressmen, will be demoted to a routine beat on the Senate loyalty commission.

Since that time, Tucker has been faced with a number of investigations and threatened investigations by Congress, the Justice department, and the S.E.C. None of them up to the present S.E.C. investigation has produced any tangible evidence of malpractice. There have also been a great number of suits brought against the corporation by 'dealers', 'stockholders', and ex-employees. Thus far, none have resulted in a judgement against Tucker excepting one for \$10,000 in legal fees.

Tucker has pointed out that this ring of snipings and harassments which has been drawn around the company, cuts it off from public and financial support, e.g., depresses its stock. The attacks from different quarters, the 'suits' and the 'investigations', have a similarity about them, he observes, as if they were part of a planned campaign. Under these circumstances what shall we think of his charge that the great auto and steel interests, in collusion with government agencies, are seeking to prevent him from bringing his car on the market? Naturally we cannot know in what way someone initiates investigations, promotes suits, slants publicity and news which is circulated nationally, except insofar as we are fortunate enough to uncover a particular connection in this place or that, such as Ferguson's tie with the Chrysler corporation. But we must appreciate what the possibilities for evidence are in the most favourable case, what the evidences would be *if* our hypothesis were true. If a planned campaign were being directed at Tucker through these diverse agencies on the part of the auto and steel interests, the evidence would not be other than what it is. The connections would be visible only in a fragmentary way, but there would be an appearance of forces working concertedly in this same direction. Yet the evidence so far mentioned is not all of it.

Though the isolation from the public and the various harassments are important, perhaps even more than Tucker estimates, it must be agreed that he faces a critical difficulty in the problem of obtaining steel. In the country of the Free Enterprise of Alcoa, General Motors, U.S. Steel, it is taken for granted and surprises none that it is impossible to obtain steel on the open market at rates that allow inexpensive autos to be built. The existing 'grey market' resulting from the restriction of production on the part of the great steel producers affects all companies not sufficiently powerful to possess special arrangements with the suppliers, or, like Kaiser, to own steel-mills

or foundries of their own. Tucker sought to solve the problem by buying a foundry from the W.A.A. known as Plancor 438 in Granite City, Illinois, but was outbid. He tried again for another foundry in Cleveland, Plancor 257, the last one available. He had high bid. The sequence of events which followed, a turning point in Tucker's original attempt to bring his auto into production, has a peculiar symmetry and richness to it, and deserves to be recounted in full.

Tucker's offered terms involved a payment of \$16,000,000 plus \$2 a ton to the government on pig-iron produced, \$1.75 on coke. The W.A.A. said it would wait ten days before making the award. It is not legally obliged to accept high bid. Tucker told the circumstances to the press, and charged that steel and automobile interests were trying to keep the foundry out of his hands. The W.A.A. appeared to be yielding. Purdy writes:

'On February 9th, Tucker was told to get firm commitments for supplies of iron ore, coal, oil, limestone, and contracts for transport by lake boats. These preparations, at a Tucker-estimated cost of \$100,000, were completed by March 17th. On April 7th, W.A.A. administrator Jess Larson, informed Tucker that his bid was receiving the most serious consideration.

On May 28th, the W.A.A. announced that the bids of both Tucker and Republic had been rejected as inadequate. . . On the same day, it was announced that the S.E.C. would investigate all Tucker operations, though Tucker complained that a previous S.E.C. investigation complete with a thirty day hearing, was only a year behind, and that he had regularly reported the company's pertinent activities.

On August 16th, 1948, the Cleveland plant was leased to the Kaiser-Frazer corporation on terms including \$1.50 a ton on pig-iron produced and \$1.50 for coke. W.A.A. explained that in the interests of the national economy it was felt that the plant should go to a concern 'presently engaged' in the making of steel. That was the end of it, and the Tucker corporation wrote finis to the tale with the statement, "The government placed us in business when it leased us our plant and permitted us to sell stock, and subsequently persons and agencies in government have made every effort to put us out of business using both indirect and overt means. Our reputation has been defamed by innuendo, and every known obstacle has been placed in our path to cause delay and devitalizing expense.

"We will use every possible means to protect our interests and to finish what we started, but if government or persons and agents in government are going to break us, we are determined that responsibility shall be publicly placed where it belongs".

The swindle perpetrated by the W.A.A. is malodorous in the extreme. The *motivation* given for allotting the plant to another bidder is direct evidence of it. 'W.A.A. explained that in the interests of the national economy it was felt that the plant should go to a concern "presently engaged" in the making of steel'. Any competent engineer who can read that, absorb its flavour, and retain his breakfast, has a remarkable constitution. The implication, in the land of touted Free Competition, of saying that no new company shall enter a given business in the interests of the 'national economy' is a juicy one. Further, there is not even the shadow of

a plausible excuse for such a motivation. A company like the Tucker corporation which proposed to operate an iron foundry presumably would not hire an assembly-line foreman to run it. It would, on the contrary, hire an experienced foundry foreman and engineering staff for this purpose, preferably the best it could get. *What would prevent it?*

Let us discover, if possible, who was responsible for the 'justification' of the W.A.A. decision and write it down for future reference, together with those other officials in this government agency. Lying and swindling have long been regarded as the prerogative of 'shrewd business men', but we have here to do with officials occupying a position of *public* responsibility. They were engaged in disposing of properties built at public expense in the prosecution of a conflict in which citizens were expected to be ready to sacrifice their lives. Their probity or lack of it must be esteemed accordingly.

A further note about the fate of the iron-foundry in question is very telling, in that it reveals the actual forces behind the negotiations. An item of February 18th, 1949, in the *New York Times* is in question. Though Republic Steel's bid had been rejected along with Tucker's, it had been operating the foundry, and has continued to do so up to and since the final leasing to Kaiser-Frazer. The item reads:

'The six-month controversy over control of a Government-owned \$28,000,000 blast furnace in Cleveland was settled amicably yesterday in a five-year agreement between the Republic Steel Corporation, which operates the facility, and the Kaiser-Frazer corporation, whose leasing of it last August precipitated a storm of Congressional and industrial protests and threats of legal action...'

The terms of settlement are: Republic continues in operation, and supplies its own customers; Kaiser-Frazer receives 12,000 tons of pig-iron monthly from the plant 'at regular market prices' which is of course an important concession by Republic when it could have made so much more on the ton; a new open-hearth furnace is constructed, 'the entire cost of which will be paid for by Kaiser-Frazer, and the output of which will be purchased by the automotive company... at regular prices'.

The Tucker company has been losing ground steadily since that time. Suits and investigations continue. It continues to search desperately for further financial backing, since the \$17,000,000 obtained by the original stock-offering has been almost exhausted. Because of the mentioned difficulties, production has not got under way, though when the company was obliged to lay off its production force a number of workers came back and finished several test-models in their own time.

Certain people associated with the company now object, as they assert, to Tucker's management. They are, in the event of a reorganization, candidates for the control of the company. Such a factional situation, under these conditions of a long delay in commencing production, is not unexpected, but let us see what is behind the groups involved. The 'Tucker distributors and dealers committee', which represents itself as the chief group, issued a formal statement on December 8th, 1948. It termed Tucker's management 'inadequate', and proposed a plan to put the company into production. The statement was sent as a letter to all 2,000 dealers and distributors of the company. 'Tucker... is so embroiled in litigation that his services to the

corporation in the foreseeable future are of doubtful value'. The plan calls for a new president 'with a background of war production experience'.

With a new man, the group believes it will be possible to obtain a large government contract to manufacture aircraft engines. 'The committee states flatly that the Navy sought at least half of the immense one-time war plant for engine manufacture'. New contracts and new management, it hopes, would clear the way for loans from the R.F.C., previously denied Tucker, and other capital. 'Under such conditions the committee believes the company can make aviation engines *and develop a commercially satisfactory automobile at the same time*'. (Our emphasis).

Now the whole trouble with this sober-seeming statement is that there is every evidence that a commercially satisfactory automobile *already exists*. What, then, can be the reason for this talk of 'developing' one? Why is it necessary for the statement to lie about this all-important fact?

We must here point out that quite without any 'inside' information, but basing ourselves solely on the comparison of this statement with evidence such as the opinion of the S.A.E. publication, and what is apparent to all in the features of the existing Tucker auto, we may say with certainty that the car would never appear in its present advanced design, if it appeared at all, in a reorganized company under the control of this committee of 'distributors' and 'dealers'. It becomes very clear what is behind this group. They are scared at the resistance from the powerful interests, they want to save their bacon by making plain to these interests that no advanced auto to compete with existing autos will be manufactured if only *they* are allowed to save their investment in the company, at Tucker's expense. They hope thereby to placate hostility, and secure the 'Navy contract' for aviation engines, 'loans from the R.F.C.' and a source of steel.

An item in the *New York Times* of February 23rd indicates that the new board of directors has demanded that Tucker should not participate in a new application for a R.F.C. loan which they propose to make, and that they wish a free hand in selling a company property, the Aircooled Motors Co. in Syracuse, in order to secure ready cash, all this according to 'a source close to the company.' Thus it appears that Tucker's opponents and, it may be, those who advocate the tactic of the above-mentioned committee, are making large gains toward the control of the company.

But let us take a broad view of the committee's proposed tactic. So far as the dealers and distributors are concerned, to whom the committee hopes to appeal, this tactic leaves them in the best case nowhere. And the same is true for the stockholders. The dealers would not, under the most favourable circumstances, have a car which is a real basis for competition with established concerns, for all their investment in franchises. In fact, they would be lucky to get a car at all, for if the present sources of pressure against the company *now* wish to make it appear that money and steel will be forthcoming if Tucker is removed and his advanced auto set aside, when this end is accomplished, they have *nothing* to prevent them from going further and destroying the company entirely.

Charges of personal errors and malpractice have been made against Tucker very frequently and from a distance it is of course impossible to form a precise judgement about all of them. But we must be extremely suspicious of the accusers and of those tactics which stem from panic, from hopes to

save investment based on smiles and promises offered by financial interests and government agencies, from belief that the situation is hopeless and each must save himself as best he can—for it is clear that, in contrast, the strategy which Tucker has practiced, adamancy before the great interests and reliance on public support of the advanced-design auto, is infinitely better in the long run.

III

We have before us, then, the best part of the facts of the short, sanguinary history of the attempt of the Tucker company to bring its auto into production, of which the outcome is the present undeniably dark situation. Ken Purdy's article, which records most of the facts which we have set down here, is sympathetic to Tucker, in the same way that experienced auto men in many places must be. Sporting a breezy sort of style which suggests Walter Winchell, he makes his main theme this: Tucker belongs to the noble line of independent auto builders who made powerful cars to satisfy the taste of auto-racers, engineers, and heroes of Hemingway novels.... 'built cars for men—men who they assumed were sufficiently firm-minded to tell their women that plaid pink upholstery never made a car go half a mile an hour faster, and so the hell with it'. Purdy does not think it worth while to extend his appeal beyond these bounds. He says in his final paragraph: 'as this was written, Preston Tucker was in admittedly precarious financial position', and adding a few more details, 'The car is a good car, and if some Congressmen don't think so, there are people in the trade who know better'. Then, concluding, he makes reference to the great present need, in which Tucker stands, of the fatalism of the professional auto-racer in the face of the inexorable 'breaks of the game'. Nothing further. For all his sympathy, it does not occur to Purdy to do more, or call on others to do more than join in this philosophical shrug of the shoulders.

This fatalism is not called for. Too much is at stake. The auto industry in America is a consumer industry of immense importance. The huge public for which the availability of better automobiles at a feasible price is a pressing matter, even one of livelihood, is closely implicated in what happens to Tucker. These auto-consumers have been put off and swindled in severest fashion for more than a decade and a half. The pressure which has thus been put on them means necessarily the presence of an implicit reaction, a counter-force, and that force is one which can be utilized.

In full-page advertisements at the time when he was balked in his attempt to get his iron-foundry, Tucker stated the circumstances of this affair and the difficulties of the company. Purdy records that the two advertisements alone drew 160,000 letters of support, some of which enclosed money, which had to be returned. This undoubtedly represents a great reserve of public sentiment. It appeared as the separate, divided reaction of people acting as individuals without connection one with another. So it remained. In the nature of the case, Tucker could not utilize this sympathy which he had evoked. But just there lies the possibility.

His policy points out the direction in which it is necessary to go in order to come to the aid of the company, yet the job is beyond the capacity of Tucker himself and his publicity, however good. That policy in publicity arises out of Tucker's peculiar situation as an industrial 'upstart' in a time of great industrial concentration combined with overall governmental regu-

lation and control. Yet it simply carries to a farther point the traditional policy of the 'independents' in the American auto industry (classically expressed by Henry Ford when he rescued himself from a financial pinch by obtaining loans, in the guise of obligatory pre-payments on large future consignments of cars, from his national network of local dealers)—which has been to rely on much wider circles for the financial and other support which is 'normally' obtained from the powers of American industry and finance.

Tucker has depended on these wider circles from the beginning. In a situation in which the great interests, aided by the governmental agencies, are hostile, support through the purchase of dealer franchises and stock has hung on public sympathy.

Thus he was eminently correct to do what he has done. He laid the company's affairs before the public with a directness and candour unknown up to the present in the industry. Further, the fate of his company is authentically a matter of public concern. It is not in the least a matter of Tucker personally, or of his company's profits. If it were not sufficiently self-evident that once the Tucker with its basic mechanical superiorities was on the market, the other companies would be obliged to meet this competition with comparable improvements, we could find memorable cases and precedents of this in the history of the industry. Chrysler activated a sluggish market in this way in 1924, Ford in 1928 with the Model A. Never in its history did the industry so badly need this stimulation, and the result could only be to the general good, not of auto-consumers only, but of everyone in America, in truth the greater part of the population, dependent on automotive transport.

'Thousands' of letters complaining about existing cars were received by the American Automobile Association in 1948. These complaints could legitimately be added to the letters written to Tucker. For, although the design of the Tucker does not answer all the complaints about current autos since it retains the conventional 'torpedo' body design which is in many respects undesirable, it is perfectly evident that in a competitive market the manufacturers will be obliged to introduce improvements in all other details.

All these complaints, together with the untold others which have not been put in letters, funnel down and focus for their satisfaction upon the Tucker affair as a test case. It becomes possible to say to each person in America dependent for livelihood, leisure and convenience on the automobile, 'Speak now, or hold thy peace'. Since it is certain that if Tucker is smashed, it will be a decisive victory for the great companies, they will have no reason to fear competition, whose potential support will hold this precedent in mind. They will have no compulsion to bring anything new into their designs for a long time to come. No other new or radical independent of importance has appeared, no other force will achieve the positive effect of the Tucker appearing on the market. Random complaints will be ineffective, if this case is lost. The consumer will have lost the natural lever of his entire cause.

Tucker could appeal to, could lay his case before, the readers of his advertisements. But at this point appears the natural limit of what is possible for him. He could hardly actively organize public support on his own behalf. In that, however, lies the key to the matter; the salvation of the company, with all it implies, depends upon *organization of public support*.

Our purpose, then, is this: to appeal to the public, at large and in existing organizations, to aid Tucker not merely with sympathy as up to now, but by a plan and in a coherent, organized way. It must first be made clear what justifies this action, that the company is genuinely and unquestionably deserving of support, that its establishment in auto production will really contribute incalculably to the relief of the present situation. Once this is established, we have the right to appeal to all organizations which profess to work for the public good, point out to them the critical need of action on *this* point and at *this* time, and may legitimately exact from them a response. Should they refuse, it will be on pain of standing condemned as unwilling to carry their professed aims consistently into actual practice.

We must address ourselves to the American Automobile Association and its local branches, which has the aim of promoting the cause of auto-owners and drivers throughout the country; and likewise to the unions, whose members, both as producers and consumers of autos, have the most direct interest in an advance in this industry. The C.I.O. United Automobile Workers, for example, has particularly put itself on record as supporting various progressive measures for the public good, as in education, price-control, or housing. In its own industry it correctly raised the demand that the company books be opened to reveal excess profits or irregularities at the expense of workers and consumers. It has spent large sums on education and publicity around such issues. To this union it should be pointed out that money and publicity used within its own sphere of affairs at this decisive time and point, will bring far greater and more tangible returns than that broadcast on long-range projects. There should be no apprehension that expansion of the Tucker company will mean unemployment in established companies: for the reasons indicated, the overall effect could only be accelerated activity and increased employment.

For the same reasons it can be indicated to the United Steel Workers (C.I.O.) that the coming into production of the Tucker will mean increased employment in the steel industry. Sometimes it is argued against the measures advocated by unions that they are 'socialistic' and 'communitistic' in character, and conflict with the American system. This excuse cannot be used in the Tucker case; if ever there was a classic example of the general benefit which may accrue from the operation of genuine free-enterprise, the Tucker case is such an example.

It can likewise be made plain to the consumers' organizations that this case is one in which the promotion of the rights of the consumers is possible on a scale hardly feasible elsewhere; and also to civic organizations in areas where auto transport is very important or fuel expensive; to civic organizations in Chicago, which would specially benefit from the operation of the Tucker plant.

What can these people be called upon to do? The answers in general form are fairly obvious. Simple publicity, first of all, has the most immediate importance for the Tucker company. We have indicated the extent of the campaign of misinformation. Counter-publicity can have a direct positive effect on Tucker's chances for finding financial aid, and for his chance of support from new prospective dealers. Thus we can call on all those organizations which in any way reach the ear of the public to spread the truth of the matter: the union papers, the publication *Consumers' Union*, the

liberal press, the *Automotive Digest* and other technical publications to the integrity of whose editors we may appeal, Fawcett publications, which has indicated a willingness to present Tucker's side of the case. Sympathetic citizens known in their localities can ask publication in local papers, or can send letters to be printed there.

Next, if the money sent to Tucker by many of the thousands of people who wrote him letters has any meaning, it will be possible to get actual present financial support. The exact mechanism by which money can be collected and made available to Tucker will depend to a large degree on legal considerations, but a few sympathetic people well-located and willing to act together should not find it hard to set up the proper framework for handling a subscription list. Union locals would do well to emulate the United Automobile Workers local of the Tucker company itself by setting aside funds for the purchase of Tucker stock.

Two obstacles face Tucker at present: money and steel. The first involves the existence of the company in immediate terms. Time is of the essence here, for unless he is strengthened, Tucker may lose control of his company to those who wish to capitulate and set the advanced auto design aside. But the second is ultimately not less pressing. One solution to the problem of steel is the association of the company with interests possessing a source of steel, e.g., Willys-Overland. This could be realized if, through public support, the company were placed in a better financial position. Failing this, however, the public likewise has it within its power to take direct measures to secure Tucker steel. We have seen the vicious rôle W.A.A. played in depriving him of his iron-foundry. Protest against this policy is essential, on the part of individuals and organizations alike, in publications, letters to papers and to members of Congress. It must be ascertained if steel-production facilities are anywhere available which are idle or in partial operation, which can supply Tucker, and pressure must be put on the government to set them in operation on his behalf. It may be pointed out that this is nothing less than the actualization in a pre-eminently important instance of avowed executive policy to increase production in the steel industry. Here also the unions have the chance to exert an important influence. It is directly in the interest of the steel union to increase production in this way: and the union locals have it in their power not only to make public protests, collect funds, etc., but also to bring their members into action, e.g., in protest against the policy of the steel mills who starve Tucker of steel.

In these ways the thing can be done. Is there anyone who is ready to say, in the face of the support that Tucker has already gained, that it is impossible because of general apathy? We should recall that the people who sent the letters were acting singly and separately, with all the limits that such action implies. But just so far as they are organized around a *plan* of action and have the consciousness of working with others, the strength of such people increases in geometric ratio. That is the potential in the situation. Letters making the proposals we have outlined above, together with copies of this magazine, will be sent out to all the places mentioned. Those associated with the magazine will make all possible efforts to advance the work and its organization, that is, proceed just as far as response makes it possible, toward further measures in conjunction with all who are willing to act.

GERMAN RESISTANCE TODAY

EDITORIAL PREFACE

In our approach to the struggles in Germany today we dissociate ourselves strongly from Allied propaganda for retrospective retribution—which leads to the preposterous notion of the guilt of nations, which gives to Military Governments the undisputed power to destroy every individual or movement which opposes them under the generalized label nationalistic, calculated to evoke in its train all the horrors of Nazism, and which is a cloak that with a great deal of success alienates world opinion from the desperate plight of the German people.¹ The task is to engage in the present-day content of the struggle for national liberation against the enslavement of Germany as a colony, to assess what is progressive in this struggle for our support both in general and in the case of individuals, without obscuring our judgement with pre-conceived notions of so-called past guilt.² We examine Pastor Adalbert Knees's Bielefeld speech and Dr. Otto Strasser's 'Open Letter to General Clay', both submitted to us for publication, entirely from the point of view of their contemporary merit for a national democratic movement in Germany. In terms of our approach it is of no immediate concern that both were at one time Nazis. Knees, it is true, broke from fascist ideologies at a later stage, though more unconditionally. Mr. Mayhew's statement requires no comment.

It is the easiest thing to indicate unequivocally the essential kernel in Strasser's approach to German affairs. Yet neither he in his article nor the Allied Press have undertaken this simple task for the clarification and the creation of responsible public opinion. The press has obscured the issue through its retrospective approach in pointing out that he is an ex-Nazi, and Strasser has dramatically recommended himself by his claim that he resisted the Hitler regime since 1930, whereas what is required is to cut across the methods of vilification and glorification of the past and to get at the content of Strasser's doctrine for a new Germany which also clarifies the past. His programme 'Aufbau des deutschen Socialismus', which today he still unfortunately upholds, has its source in and is inspired by the conception of the inequality of human beings, not conceived as a reflection of the inequality of opportunity upon which our class society is based, but inherent in man's nature as such, and inalienable. It is a view of democracy as the freedom to be unequal, or what he calls 'authoritarian democracy'—quite simply a contradiction in terms which reflects itself in his article in the anomaly of 'organizing' the opposition. The elaborate economic and political details of his programme spring from this idea (see footnote to letter to General Clay) and are calculated to perpetuate man's inequality by establishing a Germany divided into an Elite which rules and a majority of ruled inferiors.

The whole tenor of Strasser's approach is to be distinguished from the

¹ During the War, however, the National movements against Hitler were given the seal of approval. So too, the National movements against Stalin without the label of abuse. The criterion apparently is whether a 'nationalist' movement runs counter to the interests of American or British 'nationalism' or not.

² All the occupying powers would stand in the dock if the principle were universally applied.

founding conceptions of Knees. Everything in Knees is a sincere, courageous, detailed avowal of the unqualified equality of human persons, and an attack upon those who stand in the way of the return of man to his humanity. Every single struggle, whether for the right of conscience, the right to live, to shelter, and domicile, etc., is a radiation from and an attempt to see the problems of the German people from 'that higher and generally human point of view freely and beyond all political prejudice'.

Another significant difference between the two men. Knees does not conceive of a tempestuous and real democratic movement in Germany today as in any way dependent upon the so-called good grace of those who rule, whether of Governments or of 'official' German quisling administrators and parties. His attempt, based upon solid political recognition, is to build an intransigent revolutionary democratic movement in which the people themselves, through the organization of their own resources for courage and power, will determine their own fate independently of all 'authority'. 'One does not select, of all people, one's enemy and the source of one's ruin as a patron.' Not so Dr. Strasser. Not only is his article addressed to one of the 'tops' but it appeals to the ruling stratum, although it is true he proceeds by approaches to the German people as well. But lack of clarity here can easily lead to that 'intriguing' against which Knees warns. Strasser has not heeded the warning. In one of his recent pamphlets 'Germany in a Disunited World' he recommends Germany's dependence on Britain as a member of the British Commonwealth in order to eliminate the danger of German aggression and to guarantee to the German people equality among the Western nations. This is only one sample of his frequent overtures to world powers in his articles. He is very much involved in the game of power politics.

But enough. While it is important in politics to differentiate honestly and contextually between men and movements, it is important also to learn to collaborate. The arrest of Pastor Knees by British Military Government and his detention in prison from September 13th without trial, is one of the many concrete instances of the abuse of 'authority' which will yet mark the long road of the struggle of the German people for their elementary human freedoms. In these innumerable instances of the violation of the democratic rights of a nation disagreements on long-range political perspectives must not be allowed arbitrarily to get in the way of creating allies of all sorts *for and within the limitations of each specific case*. Dr. Strasser has been one of the few who has responded helpfully to our attempt to get publicised Military Government's scandalous treatment of the Pastor. The efforts of Strasser in this respect contrast favourably with the 'conspiracy of silence' on Knees maintained by the 'democratic' press of Britain and America, and the campaign against him conducted in German newspapers in the British Zone.

The present personal position of Strasser is a further concrete instance of the abuse of democracy by the Western Powers. It is a disgrace that four years after the War his application to return to Germany has been refused by them. Allied Governments in this case, as in the affairs of Germany generally, have no right whatever—except those that accrue from totalitarian conquest to the successors of Hitler—to interfere with the personal or national rights of another people. However strongly one dis-

agrees with Strasser's programme, the attempt to overcome him by authoritarian methods is entirely reprehensible. Whatever is reactionary in his politics for Germany can only be annulled politically and in Germany. It is the grave responsibility of the German people alone, in the free self-determination of their rights, to know when and how to deal with Strasser—perhaps at the point where he makes the attempt to limit their democratic struggles in order to salvage his programme and Presidency.

OPEN LETTER TO GENERAL CLAY

General,

In your recent report to Washington, which, it is true I only know from the B.U.P. extract of January 10th, 1949, you have directed a number of partly open, partly concealed attacks on me and my policy, which, in their sum total and effect, have led to the Western powers denying my return to my homeland—nearly four years after the end of the war—a 'wise decision' according to the *London Times*.

What is really held against me?

... that I am an 'ex-Nazi'!

Why is it not added that I am an 'ex-Sozi' since I adhered to the Social-Democratic Party for almost as long as to the National Socialists? (The road from international Socialism to national Socialism, to Christian Socialism, by the way, seems to be both logical and cogent—in any case, however, honourable!)

Moreover, it is time the world knew that the idea and the programme of, and the name National Socialism, did not originate with Adolf Hitler, but with Thomas G. Masaryk, the famous philosopher and statesman.—His devastating reckoning with Marxism, which I have saved from oblivion in my book on Masaryk, at that time formed the basis for the 'National Socialist Party' in Bohemia founded in 1897, whose best known leader was Masaryk himself and which only recently met its end, under the inglorious leadership of Eduard Benes. — It was the ideas of Masaryk and Moeller van den Bruck, which led a great part of German post war youth to National Socialism — and it was Adolf Hitler who betrayed these ideas and this idealism.

... And that I broke with Hitler because I 'took Socialism seriously'?

This only proves that, even during my adherence to that N.S.D.A.P. I remained faithful to my ideals and fought for these ideals against Hitler, and that I renounced for these ideals my career, my income, my wealth and the political and personal advantages which I might have expected.

For my break with Hitler, which I executed of my own free will and purely on the grounds of conviction, occurred in July, 1930—i.e. nearly 3 years before Hitler's seizure of power, i.e. at a time when Hitler's star was in the ascendant and one could gain everything by remaining in the party, and would necessarily risk everything by breaking with it!

That this break not only arose from opposition to Hitler's economic policy, but equally from opposition to his domestic and foreign policy

and, not least, his cultural policy, is demonstrated both by the text of my interview with Hitler which was already published in July, 1930, and also by the book published immediately afterwards, *The Building of German Socialism*, which later became the programme of the gathering 'Black Front'.—

... That the 'Infamous Black Front' conducted an uncompromising struggle against Hitler?

This accusation which glared at us thousands of times from the articles, full of hate, in the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, is considered a distinction by my friends and I! We are proud of having opened the eyes of the German people and the world public—at a time when foreign countries were still zealously transacting business with the Hitler Regime, concluding pacts with it and Hitler was host to British, French, Russian and Polish statesmen—to the danger which this man and his regime signified for Germany, Europe and the world.

We are proud that the 'Black Front' was not only the first but also the most active resistance movement against Hitlerism and suffered the greatest percentage of losses in this struggle. We can only marvel at hearing from you a characterization which we read thousands of times in the Hitler press, but it cannot shake our pride and good conscience.

... That I am a 'German Nationalist'?

Since when has it been a matter for reproach to be a patriot and defend the national interests of one's people?! For centuries, the decent men of all nations acted according to the slogan: 'Rather death than slavery!' and one of your greatest American statesmen in the hour of national danger, exclaimed, 'Give me liberty or give me death!' That is the spirit animating my friends and I, the spirit of liberty and independence, the spirit of responsibility towards one's own people and the representation of its vital rights and vital needs!

From this very spirit, and in the knowledge that this spirit is the common property of all decent people of all nations, and should be so, we condemn any Imperialism on Germany's part in the same way that we fight every Imperialism against Germany!—This clear distinction between nationalism and imperialism, between the defence of one's own vital rights and the violation of other people's vital rights, it seems to me has been completely ignored in your report — although I am sure that you yourself as a democratic American are also a national American.

... That we demand the return to Germany of the 'Eastern Provinces ceded to Poland'?

First of all you overlook the fact that there never has been any cession of any German provinces to Poland! — Even the Four-Power Agreement of June 5th, 1945, expressly states that until the conclusion of peace, Germany's frontiers should be those of December 31st, 1937—a fact repeatedly stressed by the *New York Times*, e.g. in its editorial of October 5th, 1948.

This is identical with our demand for the frontiers of January 1st, 1948, which clearly shows that the German Eastern provinces were and are German soil, which have only come 'under Polish administration' by an arbitrary decision of the Russians, as the U.S. Foreign Secretary of the

time, Byrnes, proves with documentation in his book. — This very claim, however, demonstrates our rejection of any imperialism; since its fulfilment expressly excludes all Hitlerite conquests, whether Austria or Alsace-Lorraine or the Sudetenland. (Whereas we demand the return and reinstatement of the population unjustly expelled from there).

... That I am not a Democrat?

Whoever claims that, cannot have read the old statement of aims *The Building of German Socialism* nor *Germany's Renaissance* in which we emphasized the demand for freedom of opposition, organization of the opposition and freedom of expression of this organized opposition, which is guaranteed in each single measure. This, however, is and remains the characteristic and foundation of every Democracy!

In this connection, it is our view that the modern and direct form of 'Representation by Councils and Professions' is a much more direct and effective representation of the whole people¹ than the indirect and falsified representation through parties, which permits the people only the 'choice' between candidates appointed by well-greased party apparatuses and who, therefore, are responsible always to the party, and not to the people.

It is understandable that the present parties which have acquired the character of monopolies and cartels through the Military Government, assume opposition to this modern democracy, this direct expression of the people's will — but it is incomprehensible, and above all, unjustified that this modern and a thousand times more effective form of democracy should be called 'undemocratic'.

What is additionally held against me?

That I represent the interests of my people — that, at the jeopardy of my life, I fought Hitler — that thousands of my friends in the 'Black Front' were sent to concentration camps by the Hitler system — that we

¹ Whilst it is true that very limited rights to elect representatives exist in Strasser's scheme (187-188)*, we must be careful not to be misled by a facade which alters nothing. On the various Councils, Professions, Circles, etc., effective or executive controls are politically firmly lodged in the hands of a small Elite directly appointed by the Supreme President, himself appointed for life (182-183). It is an 'authoritarian democracy' (184) wherein the authoritarianism is guaranteed by political appointment from the top.

Nor has the economics of his State anything whatever to do with Socialism as he would have us believe. It is based on a conception of 'entail', whereby nobody in Germany would own anything directly or in his own right, with freedom to sell or otherwise dispose of it as he might think fit, but 'possession' (Besitz), as distinct from 'private property' (Eigentum), would mean 'usufruct' — 'that one is entitled to use the thing, to exploit it, but subject to the will and supervision of another, the substantial 'owner' whose property it is.' The State would be the owner and it would allocate to individuals and collectives the 'lease-hold' right to work the land, raw materials, and the instruments of production, as it thinks suitable for the welfare of the nation. It is the idea of the State as trustee for the community of inferiors or unequals (189) that cannot be treated as responsible.

Throughout Strasser does not question the altruism of State officials committed to govern as guardians of the people, nor have the people, as we have seen, any effective political control over their conduct. *Ed.*

* Numbers in brackets refer to the relevant pages of his book 'Germany Tomorrow', the third section of which is made up of a slightly condensed translation of his programme 'Aufbau des deutschen Socialismus'.

strive for a new and better economic, political and cultural order — that we want the internal and outward renewal of Germany, upon which the health of Europe and peace depend!

You, General, are well aware of the real mood of the German people, from thousands of reports of your news officers, and in your organ, the *Neue Zeitung* of November 27th and December 11th, I read two articles ('What the man in the street is saying' and 'Why does the man in the street speak thus?') which show that you are very well acquainted with the mood of the German people, its misery, its lament, its hope and its will and that you therefore know, too, how little the rubber dolls, brought from the Weimar moth-closet, who dangle on your wires, express the will of the German people.

Therefore you also know that my friends and I give expression to this will of the German people, that we are its spokesmen and that our political aims are the aims of the overwhelming majority of the German people, particularly the millions of robbed, violated and hopeless Eastern exiles, the millions of pauperized and bombed out, the widows and orphans and, not least, the whole German youth. — If, then, the 'German democratic politicians' come to you with their fears and anxieties about us, this fear and anxiety is not directed against my friends and I as men and as a group, but against the German people! —

You, General, know that the fate of Europe is being decided in Germany. You know that this decision is being determined essentially by the attitude of the German people. A heavy responsibility therefore weighs on you and your policy; a heavier still weighs on Paris and London; the heaviest on Washington: *for the fate of the Occident depends on the German policy of the Western Powers* — for better or for worse!

My friends and I will do everything possible *for this decision to turn out to the good of the Occident.*

DR. OTTO STRASSER.

WHICH ROAD MUST WE TAKE? *

Dear Friends,

We have come together in an hour of utmost distress in order to attain full clarity about our situation and what has to be done. Our need has called us together—our need and our anxiety which have for years darkened and oppressed our lives. Need has been overwhelming in Germany and there is scarcely anybody who has not been affected by it. But nobody has been affected more than the refugee. Indeed, the German need is really the refugee's need. When I say this I think not only of the refugees expelled from the East; I think equally of the great number who have suffered war damage, have been evacuated or bombed out—of all whose existence has been shattered by the war and who now wander through life bewildered and homeless.

What sort of a life is that? But few of the local population have a correct idea of the fate of refugees. Perhaps, I too would know very little about it had I not remembered in time my duty as an East German. When

* Abridged English version of the speech delivered by Pastor Adalbert Knees on September 12th, 1948, at Bielefeld (British Zone of Germany).

I was dismissed from the service of the Church for my open protest against the methods of the Allies and the more than doubtful attitude of certain Church circles, I felt at the time that this measure was an injustice. And so it is! Nevertheless, I cannot help feeling grateful for it to-day, for it gave me the necessary outer and inner freedom to grapple in full clarity with the problems of our time. This cleared my way to the work I am doing today and has guided me ever more deeply into the tremendous need of our people.

Wherever one goes, one sees, with few variations, the same picture of misery and hopelessness. The most primitive housing conditions, often unworthy of human beings, which not only rend the nerves but also destroy morality! Different generations and sexes cooped together in the narrowest space. Unbelievable sanitation! Dire scarcity of the most elementary articles. No clothing, no furniture and—since the currency reform—deprived of the last reserve of money so that the very necessities of life are uncertain. Many people cannot even afford to buy the little to which we are entitled on our ration cards.

This economic misery is rendered completely unbearable by the spiritual and mental misery experienced especially by those expelled from the East. The feeling of homelessness and the gnawing desire for a home are a permanent drain on their strength. On top of it, there is the unspeakable disappointment caused by the almost complete failure of all western authorities, of Military Government no less than the German administration agencies who have frustrated the demands of the refugees in a quite culpable manner to this very day. Inside Germany, the refugees find themselves betrayed and abandoned in the most unscrupulous fashion. In their own country, the refugees are being treated by their own fellow-countrymen as pariahs and as second or third class citizens. Scarcely had they escaped from the wanton brutality of the Soviet and Polish soldiery when they found themselves prey to a new, a more subtle but no less consistent, wantonness.

We have all had experience of the sort of official who has no other ambition than to keep his post, to act in no circumstances against the decrees of Military Government and to keep refugees and repatriates at as great a distance as possible. We have all had experience of those commissions and committees which deserve their name only in one respect—their fear of 'committing' themselves. Upon such 'committees' the refugees were and still are dependent. Under the impression of such dependence, more than one has taken his own life, because he could and would no longer bear this state of being without rights and without redress. Such a state eventually undermines every vestige of self-respect and prepares the complete mental ruin of a people.

The limit of endurance has been reached! We have all somehow realized that we have reached the end—already again at the end—and that it cannot go on like this. If it does continue, we all will go to rack and ruin, our children, the growing youth cannot escape mental and physical sickness. Something must be done, but what? How could it be possible for us, we refugees, we proletarians of a new, better and denazified Germany to stop the misery and to alter the course of events? Certainly, there is talk everywhere today about uniting all refugees. Associations for the protection

of their interests and for settlement, committees and aid societies have been established. Many ways offer themselves—but which is the right road? Which road must we take?

When we ask this question, the whole burden of responsibility for our fate and that of our people lays itself upon our souls, the responsibility which we evaded for three years and not only for three years. This question about the road into the future not only the refugee but every German may have asked himself in his heart; it expresses all our profound helplessness.

At the same time, however, this question carries a note of self-accusation and confession, the confession that the road we have hitherto followed has again been wrong. Before we realize that there is no sense in seeking new ways. Therefore we have to ask ourselves first: which road have we hitherto followed.

And if we wish to be frank: have we followed a road at all? Is it not rather that we have allowed ourselves to be driven? When the deluge of judgement crashed over us, did not we all feel the fear tremble through us that we might be among those to be punished, among the so-called denazified? One thoughtless gesture, one open word and one was in the danger of being suspected of alleged fascist intrigues and being transferred to a camp. Every criticism, however justified, was outlawed, every protest was punishable. After all, we lived in a 'democracy', and in a Christian one at that. Surely not to me alone, but to many others it happened that at some interrogation or other (in my case because of my writings) the question was asked: why did you not protest against the crimes committed in the concentration camps? Such questions, however foolish, it was better to evade. For so great an ignorance about the true situation in Germany was betrayed that one could not be sure that one would not some day be arrested and punished for the secret crimes of an inhuman regime. We cannot deny that we were only too willing to capitulate to this permanent threat. We remained silent and were anxious not to expose ourselves in any way and not to fall by any chance into the hands of a German emigre in British or U.S. uniform. That was human, that was understandable—cowardice is always human—but we remained silent even when for the sake of our existence and our honour it was our duty to speak. Fifteen millions were, in the most brutal manner, deprived of their homeland, their dwelling, and their possessions, the 'Iron Curtain' came between us and our homes, but only few raised their voices in order to call the attention of the world in time to the frightfulness of such action.

This was not due to cowardice and indifference in every case. Many still felt bleak horror in their bones. Bewildered and like the dead they emerged from hell and, almost bereft of feeling, slipped into a new, strange, homeless and outlawed existence. But there were others who, in spite of everything, were capable of collecting the dispersed forces of the refugees and of taking up the struggle against the powers of violence, arbitrariness and treachery. Here it was really cowardice, the fear of exposing their own persons, which prevented them from remembering their responsibility. Admittedly, the assault of hostile forces was overwhelming. We could have altered scarcely anything in the actual situation. But we could have and ought to have demonstrated to our enemies that attitude of inner

resistance which, in view of all the brutal measures of retribution, it was our unconditional duty to display even as the 'guilty' ones. Instead, we tolerated denunciation, grovelling servility and cowardly submissiveness. To me it will always be incomprehensible that senior and leading administrators could prevail upon themselves to emphasize the appearance of Military Government at some purely German functions—and to emphasize it with special gratitude. Against the background of historical reality, against the background of perpetual expulsions and dismantlings such reverence and servile salutation was conspicuously painful. The refugees at least (chiefly those from the East) ought to have noticed that and it ought to have stimulated them to appropriate counteractions and protests. But even among them, fear was dominant and they thought it wiser to postpone their loyalty to their homeland and their people until a more favourable time. The intelligentsia, the educated people who were perhaps best fitted for an attempt to unify the refugees and rally them against the prevailing abuses, pursued their special interests like all the others and took care to avoid unpopularity. Here and there, it is true, regional unions, interest communities and other large-scale associations were formed. But scarcely anywhere was it possible to mobilise the refugees themselves and to persuade them to stand up for themselves.

We have travelled many roads—each by himself. Those were roads of weakness and disunity. They did not lead to the overcoming of misery. They only led deeper into collapse and to-day compel us to seek for new and better roads. The problem is in no way simplified by the fact that, in the meantime, various private organizations of refugees have been established, each of which now seeks to recruit the favour of the refugees and to win them over to its methods. Since none of these organizations is prepared to go out of existence, we, for our part, will be unable, at first, to prevent a new split. It is all the more our duty to orient ourselves and to decide.

The worst shortcoming of the refugee organizations, which have been mentioned, is that they endanger, from the very beginning, the necessary unity of the refugees. Although all assert that they desire the same thing and that they envisage the welfare of the refugees exclusively, they have not managed to overcome their reluctance to sacrifice their separate existence. This renders them questionable, particularly when they are social and economic organizations with comparatively high subscriptions. The suspicion forces itself upon us that it is perhaps not so much the well-being of the refugees as a whole which is involved as the well-being and the interests of small groups of organizers who are seeking to provide a new existence for themselves on the pennies of the refugees. In the absence of other means of earning a livelihood, it occurred to some individuals to found an organization of refugees. The territory was mapped—as extensive as possible in view of the poverty of the members—zonal or bi-zonal. The posts (regional managers, etc.) were allotted. It was inevitable that the various organizations and committees would come into conflict very soon in the narrow confines of the present German territory. Nobody was prepared to renounce his assumed birthright, not even for a mess of pottage (and that means something in the notorious food shortage of recent years).

Where the establishment of the above mentioned aid organization is involved, it is open to serious doubt whether even an approach to the

solution of the problem is possible by uniting the refugees on a purely economic basis. If one avoids all political disputes, all passionate interventions and considers one's task to consist merely in securing the greatest possible share of economic goods, one will scarcely be in a position to improve fundamentally the lot of the refugees, since we are still dependent on allocations from the Allies for all our assistance. All relief measures within the political frontiers which are allotted to our people at present are so inadequate that it is not worth while organizing refugee co-operation for this purpose alone.

In contradistinction to this, the organizations for Eastern refugees only, the Lippstadt Committee and the Lower Saxon Movement, attempt to deal with the Eastern problem itself, but they are in danger of falling into another exaggeration. Their concern is only with the East and the Eastern refugees. The centrifugal, particularist tendencies in Germany are thereby encouraged in a disastrous manner. If there is so little interest in and understanding for the problem of the German East in the local population of Western Germany today, this is in no small measure due to the one-sided attitude with which the organizations of eastern refugees have hitherto approached their work. That this attitude is dictated by certain 'realistic' considerations which are commonly called opportunism cannot be overlooked.

This submission to the 'political realities' has expressed itself in another, no less dubious manner, in the ideology of certain east German circles. They endeavoured by every possible means to become 'Government-in-exile' or, (as they have now styled themselves at Godesberg) 'Representative body of the eastern refugees.' Such governments-in-exile or representative bodies are obviously only possible through secret or open agreement with the competent Military Government. Their premise is a certain intrinsic harmony of the government-in-exile, which offers itself, with the Military Government. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that such an agreement ought never to have come about. The differences are too sharp, the wounds too recent for that. One does not select of all people, one's enemy and the source of one's ruin as a patron. One cannot warn too strongly against becoming involved in the intrigues of the world powers through proclamations of this nature and effacing thereby the clear line of an independent refugee movement. The 'Representative body of eastern refugees', established in Godesberg, is a completely un-German and undemocratic institution, for it arose without the knowledge or action of the eastern refugees. This is an indelible stain, even though the refugees—rather from a feeling of their helplessness up to now than from inner conviction—were prepared subsequently to ratify the 'representative body'. For three years, our self-evident demands have been suppressed. For three years, we have been refused not merely a government-in-exile, but the possibility of union. In the fourth year it should be beneath our honour and our dignity to orient ourselves in any way by the benevolence of the occupying powers when we make our great spiritual and political decisions. No other attitude is possible for us—this alone invests all our actions with that strength, that purity of character from which we have become increasingly estranged during the last few decades but which we need so badly.

This is the road we must take. Renegacy, irresponsibility, corruption, betrayal on the one side—mendacity, ruthlessness, brutality, on the other, so enormous that only one thing is possible; clear passionate opposition.

It is essential that the refugees themselves take the initiative, not only in order to fight for some social and economic alleviations, but in order to oppose the terrible derangement in Germany, the indifference, indiscipline, corruption, venality, treachery, disgrace of the people and its authorities, and to assert the laws of dignity, honour, truthfulness and compassion. Let nobody suppose that, in so doing, we would neglect the immediate needs of the refugees; on the contrary, this is the correct way to deal with them, but our struggle would become more elemental, more principled, more comprehensive.

I know what it is I say. I know that it can lead to public unrest and revolution—I know that and I say it none the less. For if we were only left with the choice between continuance of these conditions or revolution, then I would choose the revolution!

I have come to this way of thinking on the basis of a thorough knowledge of conditions in Lower Saxony and Holstein: What is decisive is our common task, our duty to resist a human order which can be described only as the 'dictatorship of the bourgeois beast'. It expresses itself in that passive cruelty, that heartless indifference which transforms men into unwitting murderers. Without admitting it to themselves they share the guilt in the moral and physical death of their neighbours. Whole strata of the population were and still are under that 'dictatorship of the bourgeois beast'.

Dictatorship is only to be broken! For three years, we have appealed in vain! Now only radical self-defence can help! It is one of the most urgent duties of the men, now that many of them have returned from the camps, to strive in every possible way for an all-embracing solution of the refugee problems. Not through parliamentary methods. The evictions were not carried out according to parliamentary methods. Immediate steps have to be taken. The whole standard of living in Germany must be regulated exclusively from the point of view of the refugee problem. The preferential treatment of the local population which is still taken for granted here at the Bielefeld housing office, and in accordance with which kitchens, for example, no matter how large, are not regarded as living and sleeping rooms, cannot be justified as long as refugees are housed in disgraceful camps or have to dwell, sleep and cook, four or five persons to one room. All kitchens, without exception, whether with boarded or tiled floors, must be counted as being completely equal to living or sleeping rooms. Oversize rooms must be sub-divided by partition-walls. The number of square metres per person fixed by the Allies is binding. Dwelling rooms diverted from their purpose and camouflaged as offices, must be closely checked and registered. Information about such things from the refugees must not be refused as denunciation—this has actually happened here—but must be treated as indispensable aid in tracing certain unscrupulous frauds. Those guilty must be sentenced to heavy fines and terms of imprisonment through summary judicial procedure.

In view of the great misery in Germany the prevailing jurisdiction can no longer be maintained. Officials, Mayors, regional officers who have not fulfilled their supervisory duties or who can even be proved to have

sabotaged the demands of the refugees, must suffer the most severe penalties. Their possessions must be confiscated for the benefit of the refugees.

In a similar way those local inhabitants, who stubbornly resist a fair distribution of accommodation or who even refuse with violence to accept refugees who have been allocated to them, must also be punished. It is out of the question that such asocial elements should continue to enjoy the protection of obsolete jurisdiction, in a way that I have seen on several occasions.

Our entire administration of justice needs to be thoroughly changed in this respect. The majority of law suits affecting refugees belong to the public and not the private sphere. All proceedings, moreover, must be expedited, but especially housing proceedings which are drawn out for months and years according to well-tested delaying tactics, probably in the vague hope that one day they might be settled of themselves.

Other relief measures such as collection of furniture, reduction of rents for flats, also need to be speeded up. It should be easy with the help of the revenue offices to detect business profits made immediately after the currency reform and to use them for the benefit of the cheated population. If there is not soon the equalization of financial burdens, which has been dangled before the refugees for three years and which the political parties are exploiting with a view to impending elections, we will demand an immediate preliminary levy of 3 per cent. of the existing property for the benefit of impoverished war-victims so that they will at least be able to buy themselves a shirt, a coat or an overcoat.

These demands are a vital necessity. They refer to immediate aims which must be realized, if necessary in direct conflict with the authorities. But they are not sufficient. If we were to limit ourselves to these as some groups of East Germans wish to do, it would not lead to a concentration but to a further dispersal of our forces. It is vain and exhausting to put demands before a clique of conscious or unconscious saboteurs and traitors if one is not at the same time prepared to unmask the whole fraudulent system and to withdraw oneself from its corrupting influence.

The problems of the East and of the refugees can be solved by us only in connection with the other German problems. Nobody can expect a clear testimony on the German East and a clean solution of the refugee problem from a bought Germany suffocating in cowardice and denunciation. The last three years are proof enough of this. Or will any one pretend that the eastern problem has been recognized and dealt with in accordance with its real importance? Otherwise Germany's political course since the collapse would provide quite a different picture. This is not to deny that some of our present-day politicians and officials sought to give of their best.

Certain developments in Germany present quite an extraordinary appearance when viewed from the point of view of the East and the refugees. I think chiefly of the de-nazification, the most ridiculous farce of public life. Its relative justification is indisputable. But that de-nazification and not, by any chance, the refugee problem, was represented as the most pressing problem in Germany, that is a grave indictment not only of the immediate participants, but also of all responsible politicians of our time. While the sufferings of 15 millions expelled persons threw dark shadows over Germany, there were creatures who, for food and payment,

served as beards against their own fellow-Germans and passed extremely doubtful judgements. That in the meantime many things have changed, should not be overlooked. Nevertheless, these 'courts of justice' have for a long time been unjustifiable in view of the conditions in Germany. It is a crying injustice to punish a person for no other reason than that he joined the N.S.D.A.P. in '26 or '27. At that time one at least had as much right to belong to that party as to the Socialist or Communist parties. Such retrospective punishments must be regarded as a mockery of all sense of justice, when at the same time definitely unsocial actions and obvious crimes against humanity are allowed to go unpunished and the refugees are denied special legal protection. Instead of indulging in the construction of political guilt, one should think of purging the existing administrative machinery and of finding and punishing those guilty of the failure of resettlement in Holstein, for example.

There is also the question of finance! While the refugees are denied pensions, rents and assistance payments, a large apparatus of officials is maintained in which there is no longer any sense, and which is repudiated by the overwhelming majority, not only of the refugees but of the whole German people, as a parasitical growth. For that reason we demand the abolition of all de-nazification courts and the establishment of special courts for refugee affairs. We also demand as a necessary basis for just conditions in Germany full equality of rights in public life for former professional soldiers.

With these demands we enter into the very heart of the political disputes of our day. They are part of those tasks from which we, as refugees and persons expelled from the East, cannot exclude ourselves. They are our tasks even more than those of the others. For who should stand up for those who are suffering if not those who have suffered most themselves? Who should fight to overcome lawlessness if not primarily those who have themselves experienced the state of lawlessness with all its horrors?

Woe upon us if we deny this call! Woe upon us if we again choose the way of falsehood, the path of least resistance, the do's and don'ts of Military Government. If we did that we would share the guilt for the continuance of inhuman conditions. We would permit ourselves to be pressed into the terrible conflict of conscience which those released from concentration camps probably had to live in for years, those who had experienced the infinite cruelty of the National-Socialist regime without being able to overcome it, indeed without being able to speak about it.

The third possibility is a clear testimony on the responsibility not only of the east Germans, but of all Germans, in the attempt at an open, clean but none the less passionate opposition in every case where our unconditional surrender would be transformed into absolute mental and economic servitude and our people threatened with utter ruin. This forces us into opposition for the sake of our most profound and fundamental freedom.

It is lamentable that so far such opposition has not arisen in Germany. In how reserved a manner, how carefully, the events in the German East were treated. To quote the opinion of foreigners seemed preferable to expressing oneself. Above all one was content with words. One was as cowardly as during the years '33 to '45. Why was there no German politician to tell General Robertson openly at the time that no fraternity with the

occupying powers could be possible as long as Germany was suffering from the bleeding wound in the East and dismantlings were being carried out with the aim of further destruction? *We owe such frankness not only to ourselves, but to the whole world!* We cannot do much, but this much we can do, we can abstain from all shallow and hypocritical talk of a Pan-European community of nations or a Western Bloc, as long as the measures used against Germany betray methods which deserve to be called sadistic. The infinite brutality of the dismantlings can only be recognised on the background of the catastrophe of the German East. What is unblushingly described as reparations consists in common robbery of a country which is already impoverished to the extent of being unable to live. In this respect there ceases to be any possibility of understanding. Fraternity on such a basis would be abysmal hypocrisy.

From the greatness of the tasks flows the greatness of self-sacrifice, the demand for utter devotion; I know how little we are prepared for that! I know how hopeless it is, even among us! And yet I demand it—for the sake of the great cause, but also for our own sake! *For the sacrifices which we refuse to make today will be demanded from us tomorrow in double or treble measure.* It is only this knowledge which can give us the strength for the three actions which are indispensable for a German reformation:

1. To regain full mental freedom in Germany as the first requisite for a genuine understanding among ourselves and with the other peoples. What I have been doing for three years, with most inadequate resources—and in weak isolation—that must be achieved by the whole community. I do not demand abolition of the censorship—how could one demand something as the vanquished from the victors—but I demand from you the breaking of the censorship.

2. New measures have to be taken with regard to the German authorities in consequence of the urgent necessity. Parliamentary means alone are of subordinate importance, although we should make energetic use of them in view of the elections. Tackling the authorities immediately as has been already begun in various places is more effective. In Bavaria, several refugee camps have entered upon hunger strikes as a protest against the abominable conditions of living. I think that none of us dare pass these by with indifference. Our concern must be directed in the first place towards the camps and slums. If they are not closed soon only the consistent resistance by all refugees against the ruling powers remains, refusal of civic duties and all payments (including rents) so that an emergency housing programme can be financed.

3. To tackle the Allied policy towards Germany openly by a total passive resistance. Our only possibility of proving and fulfilling our responsibility is to decline responsibility. Who is there among us who could bear the responsibility for what is happening in and to Germany? No one who is not a Quisling and a traitor to his country! That is why we must decline responsibility, more openly, more demonstratively than hitherto! Unless a stop is set at last to the continuing disintegration and pauperization of Germany, there is only one decision for the coming election: abstention! The passionate boycott of an election which, after economic enslavement, would consolidate mental enslavement. If we were to go to the polls, if

we were to continue paying attention to the petty considerations of the political parties and other licenced lackeys, we would be selling the last remnant of our liberty! Even if a troglodyte party and a handful of treacherous careerists dared to represent German responsibility against the will of the people, what harm could that do? Today traitors to their people are still protected in Germany, soon they will be so no longer. Our passive resistance would then begin in earnest—more passionately than before.

This—on the whole—is the road we have to take. It is the road of complete impotence! *No longer do weapons speak but the strength of our hearts!* Do you lack courage, strength, passion, responsibility? Then remember that the sufferings of all who were killed in action, starved and tortured to death, stand over us! Remember that the hopeless misery of millions and millions of men and women, of old and young, calls us with the voice of despair. And remember that misery and disgrace have become overpowering in Germany.

If we remember this, we will take this road! And we all will meet on this road: East Germans and West Germans, North Germans and South Germans! We will no longer be local population and refugees, but merely Germans!—Germans in a profound community of fate!

And not only Germans!—why not also Englishmen, Americans and Frenchmen and Russians and Poles and Czechs, all whose hearts are yearning for a return, for a new humanity.

ADALBERT KNEES.

OFFICIAL VIEW

8th February, 1949.

CG.295/295/184.

Dear ———,

I have now received a report from Germany on Pastor Knees, about whom you wrote to me on December 13th, 1948.

For the past two years Knees has been actively engaged in anti-Allied propaganda in both the American and British Zones of Germany. He has made violent public speeches and distributed through the German post pamphlets containing severe criticism of the occupation authorities. In January, 1947, Knees' Bishop removed him from office because of his offensive sermons. Despite a reprimand from Military Government he continued his campaign and in January, 1948, it was decided to prosecute him for the illegal publication and distribution of literature.

For a long time Knees laid low and as his whereabouts were not known the case against him was temporarily shelved. His pamphlets continued to circulate from time to time however and on September 12th he reappeared and made a highly inflammatory speech in Bielefeld. He attempted to evade the police but was caught and taken into custody the following day. His case came before a Control Commission Court in Bielefeld and he was committed for trial in the High Court on charges of committing acts hostile to the Occupying Powers and attempting to evade arrest. He is at present in hospital under medical observation and both the prosecution and defence are awaiting reports as to his mental condition.

I appreciate your correspondent's desire to rectify what he considers an encroachment on the principle of freedom of expression. I cannot accept the suggestion, however, that our policy towards the Germans is repressive in this respect. To claim as Knees does in his 'Open Letter' that the whole of Germany is in 'a psychosis of fear' of Military Government and that he has been threatened with the 'direst penalties' is, frankly, quite ridiculous, and sensible Germans would be the first to laugh at such exaggerations. Our authorities in Germany have no desire to suppress fair criticism and a study of the German Press should remove any doubts your correspondent may feel about the latitude which the Germans are allowed in their criticisms of the Occupying Powers.

Freedom of expression does not mean however that people have an unrestrained right to say what they wish irrespective of the consequences. Even in this country it has been necessary to impose restrictions and to regard as an offence such things as seditious utterances and speeches likely to cause a breach of the peace. In a country under military occupation such as Germany, where the safety of the occupation forces has to be considered, it is even more necessary to keep a firm hand on malicious attempts to inflame the population against the occupation authorities, by gross distortions of the truth such as those which appear in Pastor Knees' 'Open Letter'. I must confess that I can find few indications in Knees' letter of that 'higher and generally human point of view' which he professes and that his outpourings read much more like the work of a confirmed nationalist.

I am returning the enclosures to your letter.

(Sgd.) C. P. MAYHEW,

Parliamentary Under Secretary.

Post War Freedom

Hamelin, September 1.—A German Court here has sentenced a girl of eighteen to three months' imprisonment for stating in a letter to relatives in Brazil that the British authorities had treated the German people shamefully. The Court sentenced her on the grounds that she had spread malicious lies and rumours.

Manchester Guardian, September 2nd, 1948.

Model Re-armament

Flight-Lieut. Norman Clark, of Calne, Wiltshire, receives a bunch of flowers and model of a York aircraft from Margot Pfeil, at Gatow airfield, Berlin, to mark the 100th day of the airlift.

A Communist-controlled newspaper in Berlin calls for a military trial of people responsible for the presentation. They claim there is a Control law forbidding the 'making and distribution of model aircraft to prevent German rearmament'.

Daily Herald caption, October 4th, 1948.

Stephen D. Banner

HUMANITY'S RESOURCES AND THE NEW MALTHUSIANISM

I

IN recent years an ever-increasing amount of material has been published on the twin themes of global overpopulation and depletion of the natural resources of the earth. The literary peak of this neo-Malthusian tendency was reached in the United States during 1948 when the best-seller lists bore the names of two popularized treatises on this dual problem, 'Our Plundered Planet' by Fairfield Osborn and 'The Road to Survival' by William Vogt.

Of the two books, Vogt's is the more illuminating and comprehensive. Moreover, it lends itself more readily to our analysis because the author, unconsciously, but with unquestionable clarity, reveals all the facets of the paradoxical dilemma which the Neo-Malthusians have created for themselves. For them there is no real solution to these very real problems.

Dr. Vogt is well qualified to analyze the present status of man's imbalance with the environment from which he must sustain himself—a noted ecologist, he has done extensive field work throughout the American continent on all aspects of conservation of natural resources. And the picture, as he paints it, is frightening.

From a purely ecological viewpoint (if such purity were really possible), the most immediate single threat to civilization is the same phenomenon whose ill effects are the most permanent and irremediable: namely, the rapid and wholesale destruction throughout the world, of land suitable for either agricultural or pastoral use. In the words of Dr. Vogt, 'Man has moved into an untenable position by protracted and wholesale violation of certain natural laws'; 'It has repeatedly been shown that the productive capacity of the land varies, of course within reasonable limits, as the thickness of the A-horizon (i.e. topsoil) . . . In many parts of the world the topsoil is completely gone and the subsoil has followed it, leaving nothing but the bare rock . . . Where this has happened centuries may be required to build one inch of fertile topsoil, such as could be swept away in a single rain-storm'; and 'It takes nature from 300 to 400 years or more to bring back a single inch of topsoil and we sometimes lose that much topsoil as the result of a single rain'. The main positive and constructive feature of 'The Road to Survival' is the continued stress upon this all-important phenomenon, together with its sub-phenomena and related conditions. Secondly, and subsidiary to this main point, is a *technically* excellent exposition on how this state of affairs has come to pass, and on what constitutes sane and feasible exploitation of the earth's crust as against what is insane and suicidal.

One may ask how this has come about. The answer becomes apparent with an understanding of the effect of poor agricultural practice on the

¹ Little, Brown, and Co., New York, 1948.

² William Sloane Associates, Inc., New York, 1948.

Hydrologic Cycle. The process begins when the natural cover of the land is destroyed by fire, the axe, the plough, or merely by clearing away leaves or brush. In grasslands, overpopulation of grazing animals also destroys the natural cover.

In any or all of these ways, man sets the stage for the next phase of the process—erosion. This, of course, is the work of the elements, the chief offenders being wind and rain. As an example of what occurs, we may consider an area such as the central portion of the United States from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. In addition to being the richest large agricultural area in the North American continent, it contains all the main types of terrain and soil to be found in a temperate climate. Here, indeed, we may watch erosion at work.*

In the upper, wooded regions, the forest has been cut down and the brush and leaves cleared away. Then comes the rain. Where formerly it had sunk slowly into the ground with a high attendant rate of evaporation, and drainage occurring mainly beneath the surface, the water need not contend now with forest and shrub. It drains quickly. Both surface evaporation and seepage into the ground are lowered. Atmospheric moisture is decreased on the one hand and underground streams dried out on the other as the water courses over the surface of the land, taking the soil with it, to the already swollen and flooded rivers. The water that does reach the underground streams no longer gets there through slow, subterranean seepage. Instead, with natural barriers removed, the water is absorbed swiftly during the actual fall and in the first few hours following. This swift absorption causes further damage since it leeches the soil (so-called vertical erosion) of its mineral constituents as it goes through, packing it down, breaking up the essential granular structure, and decreasing the porosity. As this continues unchecked over a number of years, the detrimental effects worsen in roughly geometric progression. The ultimate results are even now becoming visible in the U.S. What was once forest, useful and beautiful in its own right, is becoming a dry, rocky waste.

The secondary effects on the grassland plains are even more dire. Decreased evaporation and lowering of the water tables in the forests and uplands causes droughts in the plains. With the protecting grass gone and the land dry and broken by the plough, it only remains for the rain (when and if it comes) to wash away the precious topsoil. If there is no rain, the wind, obligingly enough, will blow the soil away. In this manner the dust-bowl of the southwest was created, and the same process is even now taking place in the rich corn belt further north.

In tropical or semi-tropical regions, covered mainly by rain forest, the manner in which the soil is destroyed is somewhat different. Removal of the natural cover allows the hot sun to beat down upon the earth, killing

* The following outline is purely synthetic, constructed solely from a consideration of the topography of the region involved, and Vogt's exposition of the processes of erosion. *But*, that it is in very close conformity to what has actually happened is easily seen when we consider the creation of the dust bowls, the recurrent—almost annual—floods of the major rivers of the midwest, the increased prevalence of forest fires, the lowering of water tables throughout the area, and, most tell-tale of all, the silting of the Mississippi basin with the topsoil of the midwestern prairies, carried down by the mighty, muddy river and its yellow tributaries.

THE NEW MALTHUSIANISM

235

the soil's organic constituents, and thus rendering the land useless. Another major factor here is vertical erosion. But, whatever the mechanism of erosion may be, two correlative facts are outstanding. First, the process, once started, progresses at an increasing rate; and second, erosion control grows more difficult as erosion advances. Ultimately, control becomes impossible.

II

Approximately half of Vogt's book is devoted to an inspection of the actual and current state of affairs in man's losing battle to maintain his food supply. If one separates the chaff from the wheat and ignores the author's sermonizing and peculiar solutions, much constructive information remains. For the sake of brevity only a few of the high points of this examination will be mentioned, together with an indication of the (historic) reasons for and implications of the conditions pictured by Vogt.

He shows how in North America a rapacious and expanding capitalism is well on the way to making useless—by time-honoured methods, justified by the need for profit—one of the wealthiest regions of the earth, the land of unlimited resources. The soil of the U.S. has been mined, not farmed, and its forests stripped far beyond the point where they might perpetuate themselves. By far the major part of the American agronomy is parasitic in nature; that is to say, it flourishes by destroying the elements from which it gains sustenance.

True as this is, these facts alone are insufficient to tell the whole story. Vogt is quite obviously limited within the narrowest framework of his field of ecology. He has no historical perspective, and, therefore, gives no hint that current American practices and their resultant effects are an extension of the practices which originated in the days, not so long ago, when North America was looked upon by the Europeans (and utilized by the British in particular) as a sort of gold mine of natural resources, to be exploited as rapidly and completely as possible in order to facilitate the growth of European capitalism and to provide a raw material base for European industrial growth. This historical fact appears in its greatest significance when we consider that present American policies are not directed at restoration of resources. On the contrary, all-out exploitation of land is encouraged at home, while the U.S. is assuming towards the world the same position that Europe once occupied in relation to America. The policies of the U.S. in the international field are disguised (and perhaps motivated to some extent) by avowed aims which are seemingly altruistic in character, but the fact remains that every success of the new American internationalism is also a success for those natural conditions which cause famine and starvation. When viewed in this light, the proposal made by Mr. Truman at the beginning of his second term of office to 'develop the backward areas of the world' becomes a hideous thing.

As far as domestic policy goes, it must be said in all fairness that, since the time of the first Roosevelt, the United States has been more or less conservation conscious, but this consciousness manifests itself mainly as campaign oratory by inept and unscrupulous politicians. Vogt does not say, but it is none the less apparent, that the governmental conservation programme is dictated by the lumber and food industrialists, who, after all, have the largest economic stake in the matter. Where concessions to

sustained yield exploitation policies, or conservation measures, are made, they are grudging and incomplete.

At any rate, the picture is growing worse. Erosion is increasing. Timber resources are increasingly on the decline. Stream and ocean pollution from urban and industrial waste join with insane commercial fishing practices in threatening the edible fish population with extermination. In those fields where the government has stepped in, presumably to ease the pressures of erosion, bureaucratic idiocy has heightened the problem. Vogt clearly shows how farm subsidies have been, in effect, subsidies to erosion, because they have aided and encouraged farmers to increase range and crop populations beyond the capacity of the land to sustain them safely, and withstand erosive pressures. Again he quotes Senator Chan Gurney as saying that the highly publicized and supposedly beneficial Tennessee Valley Authority has "controlled" floods, not by holding water in the soil, but by permanently submerging more than three fourths of the land it was designed to protect.' Vogt goes on to point out that not only has the T.V.A. flooded the best land in the area, but it has neglected the watershed for the valley by bungling its forestry programme, and has virtually excluded the Soil Conservation Service from its premises. Perhaps this last was caused by fear of discovery that (in the words of Vogt) its 'multi-purpose' dams would be better named 'cross-purpose' dams.

* * * *

Latin America to the south is an area of vivid contrasts. In resources as well as in living standards, great wealth exists side by side with extreme poverty. But in both cases the poverty far exceeds the wealth. We may well believe the assertion of the author, who has spent years surveying ecological conditions in South and Central American countries, that '(All Latin American countries except three or four) are able to feed their citizens, and supply water for their many needs, only by a progressive and accelerating destruction of natural resources; biological bankruptcy hangs over their heads like a shaking avalanche. It has already fallen on Haiti and El Salvador, where hundreds of thousands of people are slowly starving to death. Unless there is a profound modification in its treatment of the land, the greater part of Mexico will be a desert within one hundred years, unable to supply even the fifteen hundred calories on which the average Salvadorian (and thousands of Mexicans) must now subsist. The same fate is in store for Chile, in perhaps fewer years.'

Much of the Latin American land is useless, either barren and mountainous, or uninhabitable equatorial jungle. However, there are large, if localized, areas of rich land, some of which have not yet been developed. Another factor in the low total productivity of this region is the synthesis between the primitive agricultural practices of the native Indian population and the procedures taken to the new land by the immigrating Europeans, who applied the techniques of their native lands without any consideration of the fact that the problems presented by the new land required vastly different solutions from those adequate in European agriculture. It appears that the result of this synthesis was to combine the worst aspects of both systems.

Standing over and above all else in Latin America is the brutal govern-

mental neglect and destruction of resources, coupled with tyrannical pressures (common in all semi-feudal, military-autocratic societies) upon those who tend the land. Vogt points out the maleficent effects of North American business policies in the Southern continent, but he does not say or see what is more important: that the oppressive Latin American governments receive full aid in carrying out their destructive policies from a none-too-subtle Yankee imperialism, to whose decided immediate advantage it is to encourage destruction of the assets of other nations, thereby reducing them to a dependent, semi-colonial status. He does show, however, that Puerto Rico, a colony of the U.S.A. is in dire straits, and, in less than 25 years, will be comparable to India in her squalor, and in the starvation level of existence of her inhabitants. In Guatemala, a more or less representative Latin American nation, Vogt quotes an Indian friend of his as saying, 'My country is a new Atlantis. It is disappearing beneath the ocean.' No more need be said.

* * * *

On a comparative basis, Europe, with the exception of European Russia, is more fortunate. In the West, the great population increases that have everywhere accompanied the industrial revolution have been accomplished, and a period of relative demographic stability has been entered upon. The peasant economies of Eastern Europe (at least up to the eras of the Hitler and Stalin occupations) were among the most advanced in the world from a standpoint of good agricultural practice. As a matter of fact, local agricultural techniques everywhere in Europe and the British Isles are excellent. But if the European peoples do not face the danger of erosion, there still remain two primary problems of mis-proportion between industry and agriculture: one in the east, and one in the west. That Vogt does not mention these two problems is significant, if not surprising. His almost pathological fear and hatred of industrialization obscures the real needs, and forces him to the false conclusion that Europe's salvation lies in the charitable efforts of the United States. Just how 'charitable' contemporary American policy can be, we will see in the discussion which follows, of these two problems of mis-proportion.

The central and eastern countries have always been the breadbasket of the continent. In the days when Western Europe was the predominant industrial imperialist area of the world, a favourable situation existed for the eastern, food-producing region. Its agricultural surpluses could be traded with the western nations for the fruits of western industry and the otherwise unobtainable raw materials of the colonies of the western nations. With Western Europe supplanted today by the United States as the foremost industrial imperialism (and, in fact, dependent upon the United States) the favourable position of the breadbasket lands was lost. Trade with the western countries, stripped of their industrial potential, had become hopelessly one-sided. Exchange with the U.S.A., still a great food producer in its own right, was impossible. There remained only one solution—industrialization. But how? In desperation, and with the help of the occupying Red Army, these countries became Moscow-sponsored 'industrial proletarian democracies', and were absorbed into the Soviet orbit of slave-colonies.

The results are at hand for examination. The area remains primarily agricultural; but agricultural production (for Russia) is decreasing, as is the standard of living of the Eastern European peoples. (Vogt shows that this decrease in production is in great part directly due to the premeditated Russian policy of establishing the peasants in farms whose acreage is less than the minimum required merely for the subsistence of the peasant operating the plot.) It is true that the old landowner-capitalists, who formerly received almost the total benefit of the trade with the west, have been eliminated, but they have been supplanted by a new ruling layer of Quislings. The new rulers gain fewer material benefits from comparatively poorer Russia than their counterparts did from the west, but their power is more absolute and their rule more tyrannical than anything their predecessors ever contemplated. Last, but by far the most important, all the significant industry in the Russian bloc has been taken over completely by the Russians. The plants are operated by Russian corporations (in the Italian, fascist sense of the word) and policed by the M.V.D., which exercises its coercive power to keep in line the unwilling nationals and slave-workers manning them. All the products of these industries, with the exception of minor bribes paid to the national Quisling regimes, are diverted to the U.S.S.R. Furthermore, *any non-Kremlin-sponsored attempts at industrialization are ruthlessly exterminated*. This must be considered in the light of the fact that the crying need for industrialization was the basis upon which the Stalinists were enabled to organize their propaganda and take over the Eastern European countries. That the inhabitants of these countries are aware of their betrayal is demonstrated by the support given to the Yugoslavian pretender, Tito, in his break with the throne. The only possible explanation lies in Tito's avowed programme of industrialization for the Balkans.

If, as we have seen, Eastern Europe is not going to be allowed to develop its industries, Western Europe is undergoing the process of the repression of its industrial capacity by the U.S. The facts which bear this out are both well known and available; some of them² are even cited by Vogt, although it is at best doubtful whether he realizes the significance of his own analysis. The process is best illustrated by the archetype Britain. The author points out how, in the final period of her greatest supremacy and subsequent decline (from 1870 to 1939), England's population nearly doubled. At the same time her share of the world's manufacture decreased from 32 per cent. to 9 per cent. Faced by competing industries in her colonies

² e.g., Statistics showing the increase in production in the U.S., and proportionate decrease in Europe. This information Vogt presents, but he overlooks the evidence in his own field. Germany's forests, in pre-Hitlerian days a model in preservation and cultivation for the rest of the world, will suffice as an example. The subject has been thoroughly considered in an authoritative report by Hans Huth of the Chicago Art Institute, which discloses that 150,000 tons of timber are being taken every month as reparations. The ecological import of this ruthless deforestation is brought out by a Swiss expert whom Huth quotes as saying, 'Deforestation in Germany (is) taking threatening forms. The German climate is assuming steppe features (Versteppung)'. *The Forestry Journal*, speaking for American interests, reaches the same conclusion, stating, 'There are many countries that view an excessive depletion of Germany's wood resources with grave anxiety, as upsetting the whole economic structure and balance of Europe, and as mortgaging the future with a problem it will take at least a hundred years to readjust'.

and other countries, ('Britain), as she lost the export market tried to meet the competition by cutting prices; in other words by lowering the living standard of her workers'.

This trend, started before World War II, has been considerably hastened since the end of hostilities by the active entry of American imperialism upon the European scene. It is an imperialism which realizes that its continued supremacy can only be assured by stamping out any competition, whether actual or potential. In this respect, it is not different from its German predecessor.

What will be the result for Western Europe if this process is allowed to continue to its ultimate end? Never a region of rich agricultural possibilities, Western Europe, due to its previous dominant industrial position, has a population density far in excess of its capacity to feed itself. The present situation is reflected in Vogt's words: 'Whether or not the rest of the world likes it, it is to a considerable extent a raw material colony of Europe—if Europe can keep it so'. He might more appropriately have said: if America wishes to keep it so. Fortunately for the Europeans, America so wishes for the present, because it needs the support of Europe in what is described as its struggle with Russia for world domination.

* * *

In his consideration of Asia, the author is obviously handicapped by lack of first-hand knowledge, and he can do little more than describe the land and repeat the old Malthusian tenets, in terms of the outmoded 'Yellow Peril' doctrine: that tremendous population pressures in China, India, and Asiatic Russia may yet bring hordes out of the East to destroy western civilization.

But perhaps this is too harsh. Many of Vogt's comments are good. For example he points out the striking similarity between the development and final position of Japan and England. Japan, in only 75 years, became the leading Asiatic power, incidentally trebling her population in the process. Forced by western suppression of her conquest of markets to expand militarily, Japan embarked upon the adventures which landed her in her present ignoble position. Vogt, of course, conceives of Japan's actions as being caused solely by population pressures. Nonetheless, he implies that the Japanese people received just punishment for the adventures. [Why, Dr. Vogt? For imitating their betters? S.D.B.] Certain aspects of the Japanese scene, though, he correctly stresses. The Japanese farmer has carried plant breeding and development to a point to be admired and imitated by the rest of the world. Reforestation procedures throughout the islands are excellent, and the Japanese have kept soil erosion to an admirably low point. To a somewhat lesser degree, the same is true of China, South-

* That the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are engaged in a struggle for domination is beyond question. But, below the visible surface of this struggle, and by far more important, is the effort of the U.S.A. to dominate and repress the European economy. In practice the European governments are offered a dole, in return for their submission to American policy, and subordination to American economic ends. As an alternative they are threatened with the questionable mercy of fascist Russia and their native Stalinists. In this manner, both the charity of the American public, and the tyranny of the Kremlin, are weapons in the hands of the U.S. government—to be used against the European people.

western Asia, and Indonesia. In all these lands, agriculture, although less parasitic than in the west, is primitive and unmechanized. The effect has been that only the more accessible regions have come under cultivation and the population density per acre of arable land *under cultivation* is incredibly high by western standards. Vogt does not seem to mind this at all. On the contrary, he is quite glad that the unused land has not been exposed to *possible* bad practices. In addition, he says, in typical fashion, of Japan, 'The Japanese possess the not inconsiderable advantage [! S.D.B.] of being accustomed to a lower standard of living'.

With regard to Russia, which is included *with* Asia in his analysis, Vogt is understandably handicapped by a lack of reliable information and, for the most part, can only engage in speculation. Apparently, the Stalin regime is repeating the mistakes made by the New World in developing its internal empire (which is quite similar to North America in its major topographical aspects).⁵ The Russians, in their development programme, have the advantage of a knowledge of the errors made in North America plus an extensive and excellent research programme by Russian naturalists and soil chemists; to their disadvantage are the ills of centralized totalitarianism—what Vogt aptly terms 'unwieldy overcentralization' and 'the clumsiness of a bureaucracy largely headed by scientific ignoramuses and shot through with terror and politics'—plus the factor of what is optimistically still called 'kulak resistance'. Not only are the coerced labourers now employed even less co-operative than the kulaks were, but they also indulge in active sabotage.

* * * *

Australia is cited by Vogt as a country which apparently had been trying as hard as possible in the past to transform the entire continent into a desert. Only recently has the success of this endeavour frightened the Australians into taking the first steps to stop the stupid practices that are bringing this metamorphosis about. In contrast, Vogt gives Palestine as an example of a land where the desert can be put to man's use on a continuing basis.

'The dying land' and the poorest of the continents is what the author calls Africa. Characteristically, he writes at length about what he considers the greatest imminent danger to Africa—the proposed programme for the extinction of the Tsetse fly. If successful, this programme would allow the Africans greatly to increase their volume of grazing and farming. In Vogt's eyes, this can only lead to the destruction of the lands made habitable, and the even worse secondary effect of multiplication of the native popu-

⁵ An illuminating sidelight to the current American controversy on conservation is offered by articles in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, cited by *Time*, *The New York Times*, and Harold Ickes (syndicated column in *The New York Post*). These articles note the American problem and gloatingly state drive to the effect that 'a decadent capitalist imperialism' is by its very nature unable to cope with the problem of its natural resources, but that 'the democratic, socialist Soviet Union', under the leadership of the great Comrade Stalin, is developing and conserving its resources to an extent never before thought possible—and more of the same rot. The articles then summarize the newly launched Soviet plan for conservation, which turns out to be nothing more than a copy of the ineffectual and inadequate programme of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. In this instance it is difficult to discern the difference between 'decadent capitalist imperialism' and 'democratic Soviet socialism'. And not only in this instance.

lation. As a matter of fact, Vogt decries the improvement of living standards anywhere in the world, because he (incorrectly) assumes that an increase in the standard of living is followed by a proportional increase in population, with worse after-effects.

III

The critics of Vogt have adopted a very derisive attitude. While admitting (at least through discreet silence) that the bare facts of the lamentable state of affairs summarized above are true, they dismiss the conditions as passing phases, easily combated by modern science. Such diverse representatives of the American political scene as *Time* and Max Lerner (of the *New York Star*) have made almost identical criticisms of Vogt. As a basis for minimizing Vogt's warnings, they first give statistical and technical objections, which, while not incorrect, carefully ignore the bad side of the picture and present only the good—and that in terms of possibilities only. They all then damn what *Time*, in its issue of Nov. 8th, 1948, calls 'the superisolationism' of the Neo-Malthusians. Furthermore, these critics all have this in common: their objections are not, legitimately, directed at Vogt's conclusions, but, rather, at the irrefutable facts (of starving populations and disappearing resources) which he presents. It is not difficult to see why this is so; these very criticisms make it quite clear that the facts are *in themselves* sufficient to demonstrate the criminal folly of American foreign policies.

Although their deprecation of the seriousness of the situation is inexcusable, the critics are correct when they imply that the state of our knowledge and technology makes it *possible*, for the first time in history, for man to be the complete master of his environment. Let us examine some of the means by which science has made *potentially* feasible the support, on a high standard of living, of a global population almost double that of the present.*

Vogt maintains that without adequate topsoil, nothing can be grown. He neglects to mention that through proper fertilization and crop rotation, topsoil can be made. The process is slow and requires zealous husbandry as well as an extensive knowledge of local conditions and requirements. But it is possible, and economically feasible, under existing conditions at that, as has been proved by current practices of farmers using modern methods in the U.S.A. As a matter of fact, large areas of American agriculture, by using large quantities of inorganic fertilizers on what would otherwise be totally 'played out' soil, and by rotating legumes with grasses as they go along from year to year, are producing annually the topsoil elements necessary for the sustenance of the greedy row crops. This method of farming depleted soils *without mining them* is not con-

* In the discussion which follows in the next four paragraphs of this article, much of the material was suggested by the address of Carl S. Miner in New York, January 7, 1949. Dr. Miner, an outstanding industrial-agricultural chemist who is called 'the father of the furfural industry', delivered this address—a technically impeccable rebuttal of the neo-Malthusian dogma—on the occasion of his acceptance of the Perkin Medal for 1948 (combined award of the Society for Chemical Industry, American Chemical Society, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, and the Electrochemical Society).

We are further indebted to various U.S. Department of Agriculture publications, especially those of the Agricultural Research Administration.

sidered either novel or startling. On the contrary, it is standard practice in much of the country, and differs from the good practices, mentioned above in connection with Europe and Asia, only in the size of the operation and the use of inorganic and synthetic fertilizers.

Another great error made by Vogt is his one-sided stress upon the tried and true practices of land reclamation and erosion control. Good and necessary as these things (such as contour farming, irrigation, drainage control, and watershed protection) are, such one-sidedness obscures the fact that, with proper technique, production per acre can be increased enormously *on existing acreage* without aggravating the dangers of erosion. The techniques are many, varied, and universally applicable. They include: increasing productivity of soils by investigating and applying the optimum adjustments that should be made, in each case, in regard to pH, trace elements, living organisms, and the type of plant best suited to the particular climatic and soil conditions present; increased usage and development of hybrid plant strains including both the types that give a greater yield per acre, and those that yield more food per pound; development of new and better fertilizers⁷; and proper use of the new, highly effective insecticides (D.D.T.), rodenticides (Antu and 1080), and herbicides (2, 4-D). Even more promising is hydroponics, the cultivation of plants in chemically charged water, independent of the soil. Hydroponics is out of the laboratory and has become feasible on a tonnage basis. U.S. troops on Ascension Island, and other Pacific bases, were fed throughout the last war on vegetables grown hydroponically, but the objection has been raised by both Vogt and his critics that hydroponics will not do because it is not economical from a standpoint of bookkeeping. This objection merely strips bare the timidity of the bourgeois imagination. Mass starvation and malnutrition are a drain on any economy. It is inconceivable that hydroponics is less economical than these evils, and it should certainly be utilised as a stop-gap. Hydroponically-grown produce can be made immediately available and will eliminate food shortages until more economical sources are developed.

These food-growing innovations and improvements are only a part of the whole, and can be supplemented by recent developments in the related fields of food technology, industrial chemistry, biology, bio-chemistry, and animal physiology. Food losses due to deterioration can be decreased by the new quick freezing techniques, and by control and dissipation of evolved heat in grain storage bins; cellulose from wood-waste, cottonseed meal, corncoobs, etc., can be converted into sugar by acid hydrolysis; increased usage of wholly synthetic products will serve to make more land available wherever they replace a product of the land (e.g. replacement of cotton by nylon); further application of ion-exchange resins to the sugar industry will result in increased yields, and allow lower grade raw

⁷ Those by-products of chemical industry that are now discarded as waste are one potential source of fertilizers. Another, exploited for the first time with the success of pilot operations at the plant of Frazer Products, Inc., Mt. Wolf, Pa., is the manufacture of compost from sewage sludges. *The New York Times* of February 8th, 1949, calls this compost 'super rich earth' with all the (harmful) bacteria destroyed, and declares in addition, that the use of urban sewage for fertilizer will 'prevent continued contamination of rivers and waters now made impure by dumping those materials'.

materials to be utilized; and last, the expansion of the use of vegetable substitutes for animal fat and protein will relieve pressure on the land, because far less acreage is needed to support the vegetable materials than is required for comparable (in food value) amounts of sheep, cattle, hogs, or poultry, and their feed. Perhaps more progress has been made in the last noted instance than in any other, as evidenced by (1) the tremendous expansion, in the last 30 years, of the vegetable fat and oil industry, which uses for raw-materials by-products such as cottonseed, or easily grown materials like peanuts, soyabeans, coconuts, and sunflower seeds; and (2) the very new, but equally promising use of protein hydrolysates, from similar raw materials, to replace meat protein. Both types of vegetable substitute are equal in nutritional values to their meat equivalents.

So far we have only dealt with techniques of tested applicability, some of which are in use on a large scale, some partially or in negligible quantity, but all fully developed and suitable for immediate mass application. There are other equally promising innovations that are still in the pilot plant stages of their life but, nevertheless, must be mentioned since laboratory and pilot applications have proved in each case that these developments can be used to any extent deemed necessary, when and if society sees fit to underwrite their further expansion. Plankton (the minute plants and animal-culæ found in the sea) can be cultivated in quantity in great inland reservoirs, and used either as feed, fertilizer, or to sustain tremendous quantities of fish in these reservoirs. Ammonia salts and Urea (which take no more than air and water as the raw materials for their synthesis) can be used to supply one-third of the protein feed of ruminant animals. The technique used is to introduce micro-organisms (which convert the salts and urea into protein) into the stomachs of the animals. Another field from which great things might be expected, as yet in its earliest infancy, is that of synthesizing edible foods from petroleum hydrocarbons.

But most important of all is still another development* which is even now in use at a plant in Jamaica, B.W.I., producing five tons a day of tasty, highly nutritious food from waste substances, and at a cost lower than

* The technical work done, and papers published on algæ and yeast cultivation and related subjects is extensive. Below are listed a few of the leading organizations and researchers, whose papers may be checked by the interested reader by referring to *The Chemical Abstracts*, published by the American Chemical Society. They are Drs. H. A. Spoehr and H. W. Milner of the Carnegie Institute Laboratories at Stanford University; the U.S. Forestry Service Laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin; Dr. P. N. Agarwal of India; Dr. D. M. Greenberg and associates at the University of California; and Drs. A. Calvin and M. Benson of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission at the University of California. The work of Drs. Calvin and Benson, particularly, has thrown light on the more basic problem of photosynthesis, and has brought man many steps closer than ever before to his great dream of reproducing the natural photosynthetic process.

Symposia on yeast investigations were held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in November, 1948, and at the Congress of Biological Chemistry in Paris in October, 1948. Further, *Look* (Cowles Magazines, Inc.) engaged Dr. R. S. Meier to investigate all research on both yeast and algæ cultivation, and to prepare a report summarizing the developments that have been made. Dr. Meier's 300 page report has been completed, but, unfortunately, had not yet been published at the time of this writing. However, *Look*, in its February 1st, 1949 issue, printed a brief non-technical summary of Dr. Meier's paper, written by Nat S. Finney, 1948 Pulitzer prize recipient. Our information has been drawn from all the sources listed above.

that of any comparable agriculturally produced foodstuffs. In the Jamaica plant, waste molasses is fed in the form of a mash into chemically charged tanks to specially developed yeasts. These yeasts enzymically digest (eat) their carbohydrate feed (the molasses in this case or any carbohydrate in general) and also convert the digestion products (such as alcohols) into edible substances. By proper control of chemical composition of the water, temperature, agitation, etc., up to 44 per cent. of the weight of the resulting product is protein material. By varying the conditions, up to 30 per cent. is bland vegetable oil. The remainder in either case is edible carbohydrate. And all is free from such undesirable and inedible materials as crude fibre or malodorous and bad-tasting side-products, ordinarily associated with certain plants or the common yeasts.

The objection may be raised that this does not solve the problem of food-shortage because the raw materials for the yeasts, such as molasses, wood sugar, or otherwise inedible plants and grasses, must still be grown by normal agricultural methods, using the over-taxed soil. This would, indeed, be a valid criticism were it not for another even more important discovery. The alga, 'Chlorella', a single-celled, green nitrogen-fixing micro-vegetable, can be cultivated on a tonnage basis in shallow pools. The only elements necessary for its growth are air, water, sunlight, agitation, and minute amounts of a few inexpensive salts. There is no limit to the amount of algæ that can be cultivated, and the expense, which is initially small, decreases as tonnage production increases. Chlorella pools yield from two to five times as much weight of edible food per acre as any common agricultural product, and the algæ are a perfect feed for the yeast-digestion process, since there is no waste material present, such as stalk and stem in plants.

All these developments (and perhaps algæ and yeast cultivation alone), *if applied on a scale of sufficient magnitude as they can so be applied*, could supplement present produce from the land to an extent that would make the pessimistic forebodings of the adherents of Malthus quixotic. An adequate food supply would be assured; it would be but a small problem for food technologists to make the new products highly appetizing; no longer would a pressing need for sustenance force man to adopt destructive agricultural practices; and Vogt—no longer impelled to prophesy disaster—could devote his full energies to land reclamation. But apparently no such applicability is assured. The critics of neo-Malthusianism, after drawing attention to the *possibilities* evoked by science, hastily dismiss the subject as closed. Further discussion will prove embarrassing and is studiously avoided. The scientists, who have brought about these *potentially* revolutionary discoveries, remain safely isolated and aloof from any questions of application. And on their side, the neo-Malthusians, unable to cope with the import of the new discoveries, ignore them—and continue to preach impending doom.

We are now enabled for the first time to see the real problem. The industrial revolution has at last caught up with man. Up to the beginning of the seventeenth century, human population had been slowly and evenly increasing, checked here and there by famines and natural catastrophes, until, in 1630, it had reached the record figure of over 400 million people. Then came the era of dynamic capitalist expansion and the concurrent

further increase in population. The world's population doubled from 1630 to 1830, and again from 1830 to 1900.⁹ The figure is now 2.25 billions, or five and a half times what it was a scant 300 years ago.¹⁰ Thomas Robert Malthus, writing his 'Essay on Human Population' in 1798 when population increases were still merely gathering momentum, was aware of this trend, and predicted that human population would in a very short time outstrip its food supply with disastrous results unless the birthrate was immediately and drastically reduced. William Vogt, 150 years later, goes much further. His accord with the general scheme of Malthus is demonstrated by such statements, repeated profusely throughout the book: 'As the number of human beings *increases* the relative amount of productive earth *decreases* by that amount'. Furthermore, Vogt far exceeds Malthus in his appraisal of the seriousness of the dilemma. To Vogt, 'the two curves—of population and the means of survival—have long since crossed. Ever more rapidly they are drawing apart.'

Malthus was proved wrong because he was unable to interpret the future in any terms but those of the past. Extremely conscious of the geometric increase of population in his time and the miseries attendant on life in previous days when human density on the earth was much lower, he could see only one result from equating these two facts—catastrophe. But the dynamism of a *then progressive* capitalism gave him the lie by opening new areas of the earth, improving then current methods of food production, and, perhaps most telling of all, vastly expanding productivity through mechanizing and specializing labour.

Vogt's prognosis of doom, likewise, can be refuted for repeating the basic error of Malthus—interpreting the future in terms of the past. The same bourgeois organization of society that negated the original Malthusian tenets now is the sole obstacle that blocks the path of progress. It has been pointed out here that the means and knowledge necessary to provide an abundance for the whole population and more are at hand—despite the fact that Vogt and his adherents dismiss them with a few words of deprecation. Yet there are no signs of these being applied to any appreciable extent. Why this is so becomes apparent with the realization that the saturation point of the possibilities of capitalist expansion had been reached at the time of the first world war. The present tendency is the repression of competition by destruction of productive potential—both man-made and natural. Only if this tendency (demonstrated most clearly by the great powers in their treatment of all other people) remains unchecked will Vogt's prognosis hold. *Ecological sanity, or any other type of sanity, is impossible unless the cultural milieu in which it is to exist is favourable.*

That Vogt is aware of this can best be demonstrated by a glance at the solutions which he advocates. Since he is unwilling to criticize society too harshly, and in so doing lay bare the real problem, he advocates not one, but two, demonstrably false paths out of his ecological maze. The one

⁹ These figures, which are more conservative than the estimates of Vogt, are taken from Fairfield Osborn (op. cit.).

¹⁰ This estimate (of 1947 population) is from 'Human Breeding and Survival' by Guy Irving Burch and Elmer Pendell, original publisher Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C. as 'Population Roads to Peace and War'; reprinted by Penguin Books, Inc. under title used above).

solution (which he really does not seem to believe in himself, but presents only for the sake of propriety) is vaguely optimistic, and, even at first glance, totally ineffectual; the other arises out of the superstructure of organized western society, is viciously despairing, and threatens far greater ills than those it purports to cure.

We can easily dispose of the first solution. In the best manner of a conditioned Rotary Club orator, Vogt pleads for such vague soporifics as clear thinking, high-minded leadership, undefined research programmes, democratic governments to lead the way, etc., *ad nauseam*. All this would be beneficial and commendable—if practicable—but, as evidenced by his other solution, Vogt does not think a resolution of the world's plight by such means will be achieved under present conditions.

If the first solution is little more than a polite 'pep talk', the second is almost ghoulish in character. Vogt completely despairs of the future and of any way out of the demographic quandary. And so he turns to the relative simplicity—and barbarity—of the past. The very first step he advocates is reduction of population *by any means possible*. Indeed he hammers away at this theme on almost every page of his poorly organized book. A few quotations will suffice to give the tone:

- p. 28 'Malaria has actually been a blessing in disguise.'
- p. 186 'One of the greatest assets of Chile, perhaps its greatest asset *is its high death rate.*' [Emphasis mine, S.D.B.]
- p. 87 'Large scale bacterial warfare would be an effective, if drastic, means of bringing back the earth's forests and grasslands.'
- p. 281 'It' (the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) 'should not ship food to keep alive ten million Indians and Chinese this year, so that fifty million may die five years hence.'
- p. 282 'There is more than a little merit in the suggestion of 'sterilization bonuses'; small but adequate amounts of money to be paid to anyone—especially the males—who will agree to the simple sterilization operation.'

It would seem that it is but a short step from such proposals to advocacy of total genocide but that is an unwarranted assumption at the present time. That murder by neglect is the keynote of the day (and Vogt is riding the crest of the wave) is best evidenced by the slave camps of Hitler and Stalin—a form of economic organization where people are allowed to die of overwork, malnutrition, and inadequate medication. Less extreme, but also successful are the methods, practiced by both east and west of repressing colonies and competitors alike by retarding their industrialization, depriving them (through trade barriers, currency manœuvres, and outright force) of the products of other lands, and by promotion of internal conflicts (as in the British Empire). We mention the British Empire advisedly, for all these methods are but the logical extension and intensification of classical colonial policy, in which successful domination was promoted by keeping the standard of living of the colonial peoples at a low level, and by fomenting inter- and intra-colonial antagonisms.

Significantly, Vogt is completely in accord with these phenomena. His attitude towards backward countries is perhaps best illustrated by the following: 'Industrialization would help Puerto Rico for a time at the

expense of the continental workers with a higher living standard, but unless the senseless proliferation can be checked, no substantial improvement can be expected . . . Why the U.S. should subsidize the unchecked spawning of India, China, and other countries by purchasing their goods is difficult to see . . . The high cost of policing parts of Europe and Asia . . . and the vast loans with which we are trying to prop world economies, and which few people doubt are gifts, at the same time forfending our own depression, are another . . . ' (symptom of the coming decrease in the American standard of living as the result of these policies).

What Vogt means here and elsewhere is that the United States should maintain its high standard of living and position of superiority at the expense of the standard of living—and the lives of the inhabitants—of less favoured nations. When the rest of the world has been reduced to sparsely populated pastoral colonies, the position of the United States will be secure and the erosive threat will have been dispelled. Needless to say this scheme implies and requires the failure of Russia's identical programme. It never occurs to Vogt that this is the road which will throw civilization back centuries into conditions of national slavery such as have never existed before. But Vogt himself, through his description of the poverty and insecurity of life in primitive and feudal cultures (when over-population and erosion were comparatively minor or non-existent problems), provides the clue to what would be one result of this new barbarism if it were carried out to its logical conclusion. If the world were reduced to the primitive level he seems to think desirable, the problems he deals with, rather than being solved would probably be intensified. For example, speaking of America, the so-called richest of the continents, he says, 'The Indians of the United States never' (were enabled to reach) 'a population in excess of a million . . . In such (Central American) countries as Mexico, Honduras, and Guatemala, their populations exceeded the carrying capacity of the land. They drew more from it than it was able to produce on a sustained yield basis . . . and one after another their civilizations vanished.' We may attribute the failures of the American Indians to live off their environment successfully to backwardness. In the midst of virginal and almost limitless resources the social structure of the Central American Indians was so static and reactionary that with their economies they could envisage tapping only the smallest part of the abundance of natural wealth within which they lived in isolated, comparatively barren islands; in like manner their *socially determined* technology was so parasitic that, in the end, it served as the implement for their cultural self-annihilation. The lesson to be drawn from this is inescapable. If the social regression of today is allowed to continue as Vogt seems to desire, all the advances of technology will degenerate into mere tools of destruction. In the field of agriculture this is evident even now. Inorganic fertilizers are being used in large quantity not only for the eminently correct purpose of increasing productivity of marginal farming land, but also to stimulate forced growth of produce which is necessarily of inferior quality. This, of course, reduces production costs, but only at the far greater expense of the nutrition of the vegetable eating public. An even more direct illustration of the reactionary misapplication of American agricultural advances is that the surplus produce resulting from these

improvements in technique is being used, via E.C.A., to stifle European productivity.

By way of final refutation of Vogt's proposals, it must be recalled that agriculture shows the greatest productivity per acre in those areas (Japan, China, Indonesia, parts of Europe) that rank among the highest in number of people working each acre of arable land. This is precisely because necessity has fostered the best practices in these regions. Although productivity per man-hour is very low by American standards, productivity per acre is extremely high when the land is densely populated and farming is intensified. It follows that what is needed is not, as Vogt wishes, a reduction of both population and industry. Instead farm populations and industrial capital must seek a common, optimum level of density throughout the world, and a more equitable distribution of the products of agriculture and industry must be effected. Truly amazing increases in the volume of both would result.

IV

No more space need be wasted on the solutions of Dr. Vogt. The truth is that there is not too little redeemable land, but too much official and social repression which prevents the land from being redeemed. Nor does any *real* demographic problem exist or even threaten to evolve; rather a dying culture, in order to stave off its decline, deprives the world's people of the means to feed themselves, thus *creating* the problem of overpopulation. Finally, there is no *potential* shortage of the synthetic products needed to supplement natural diets; instead the self-interests of the world's masters do not admit turning these potentialities into actual facts.

The prospects of a cultural redemption dim daily. Up to the present century (with the exception of the exploitation of the classical colonial peoples) the oppression of our mode of society was haphazard and unorganized—it was merely the oppression of groups of individuals by other groups. Now, with the limits of productivity of capitalist organization attained, the structure cannot effectively perpetuate itself by haphazard oppression alone. The result has been a systematization and collectivization of oppression, with the state increasingly taking the lead in the process of organization. While this process was national and internal the results were not obvious. But it has become international, with each central agency of oppression (that is to say each of the individual satiated governments, or temporary and shifting blocs of governments) attempting to destroy the others.

One result of this most recent, internationalist phase of the organization of oppression has been two world wars. Another has been the limitation of productivity in the less successful countries. This last has caused the situation which so alarmed Vogt and others that, unable to see the cause for the results, they have mistakenly applied the old, outworn doctrine of Malthus. That their application has been barren of success is not surprising. A cure for depletion of resources and apparent overpopulation can be attempted with hope of success only when a higher level of social organization has been reached, and when government is organized on a *completely* and genuinely democratic basis. The means for a cure are at hand now; the possibility of using them is not.

t
e
a
l
e
e
f

n
d
s
a
e
-
s
s
s

t
il
-
r
n
d
n
s
ts
al
i-
o

n
n
ne
se
ne
ot
on
al
a
re

F

Zv

De

De

Zu

U

Er

C

5

F

a

an

co

ag

M

p

m

C

b

a

C

5

FOR all who read German, we recommend our sister publication

DINGE DER ZEIT

Contents of No. 4, now appearing:

Zwischenbilanz	E. Zander
Der Fall Pastor Knees	
Der letzte Isolationist	Ch. Graham
Zu Fritz v. Unruhs 'Bekennntnis' in der Paulskirche	U. Craemer
Ueber amerikanischen Militarismus	Ray Jackson
Erziehung zur Demokratie?	S. v. Vegesack

**CONTEMPORARY PRESS, 10 Blomfield Court, London, W.9, and
545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York**

PARCELS FOR GERMANY

The need is great—food and clothing parcels are for many people literally a matter of life or death, especially for those who sacrificed their strength and health in the struggle against the Hitler tyranny. Among them are countless tried and tested anti-fascists, who carried on their long struggle against the régime independently of the large parties and organisations. Many of them had to suffer long years of imprisonment as a result of political 'crimes' and are suffering from the prevailing want to-day all the more, as they are not receiving any help from the large organisations. *Contemporary Issues* accepts money and gifts of food and clothing on behalf of these isolated individuals. All contributions will be acknowledged and should be sent direct to:

**CONTEMPORARY PRESS, 10 Blomfield Court, London, W.9, and
545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York**

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES can be obtained from:

BRITAIN

Contemporary Issues, 10 Blomfield Court, London, W.9
W. H. Smith & Son, Ltd.
Librairie Populaire Ltd., 67 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, W.C.1
News Store, 10 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1
E. A. Green, 22 New Bedford Road, Luton
W. and J. Linney Ltd., West Gate, Mansfield
W. Heffer & Sons, Petty Cury, Cambridge
Weatherhead's, Market Square, Cambridge
W. & R. Holmes, 3 Dunlop Street, Glasgow
Andrew Elliott, 17 Princes Street, Edinburgh
E. Cheeseman Ltd., 3 Market Hill, Barnsley, Yorks.

U.S.A.

Contemporary Press, 545 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.C. 17, New York
Periodical Dept., Brentano's, 1 W. 47th Street, N.Y.C., New York
Gotham Book Mart, 41 W. 47th Street, N.Y.C., New York
Kulak-Engelman-Reiff, 802 W. 181st Street, N.Y.C. 33, New York
Stanford Union Store, Stanford University, Stanford, Cal.
Paul Elder & Co., Stockton & Sutter Streets, San Francisco, Cal.
Daliels, 2466 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley 4, Cal.
Roosevelt College Bookstore, 430 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
University of Chicago Bookstore, 5802 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Uptown News Co., 236 Huntington Avenue, Boston, Mass.
World Book & News Co., 1652/60 N. Cahuenga Boulevard, Hollywood 28, Cal.
Smith News Co., 613 1/2 So. Hill Street, Los Angeles, Cal.

INDIA

Bhawnani & Sons, Connaught Place, New Delhi
M/S The Kitabistan, 17A Kamla Nehru Road, Allahabad
S. J. Co-operative Society, Hyderabad, Sind.
Thacker, Spink & Co. (1933) Ltd., 3 Esplanade Road, Calcutta

PAKISTAN

M. K. Rehman, Kitabistan, 46 Zeenat Mansions, Macleod Street, Karachi

MALAYA

City Book Store, Winchester House, Collyer Quay, Singapore

EIRE

Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 21/22 D'Olier Street, Dublin
Hodges, Figgis & Co., 20 Nassau Street, Dublin
Geo. D. Crokes Ltd., 81 Quay, Waterford

FRANCE

W. H. Smith & Son Ltd., 248 Rue de Rivoli, Paris

SOUTH AFRICA

Van Schaik's Bookstore (Pty.) Ltd., Libri Building, Church Street, Pretoria
Vanguard Bookshop, 28 Joubert Street, Johannesburg
Nasionale Pers Bpk., 30 Keerom Street, Capetown
H.A.U.M., v/h Jacques Dussau & Co., Church Street, Capetown

AUSTRALIA

The Book Depot, 288 Little Collins Street, Melbourne C.1, Victoria
Alberts Bookshop Pty. Ltd., 14/22 Forrest Place, Perth, Western Australia
Barkers Bookstore, Brisbane, Queensland
A. W. Birchall & Sons Pty. Ltd., 118 Brisbane Street, Launceston, Tasmania

CANADA

Canadian Forum, 16 Huntley Street, Toronto
Rendezvous Book Store, 734 Yonge Street, Toronto

